NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Royal Oak, Michigan | November 25, 1940 | Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year | 10c

HITLER AND MOLOTOV DECIDE WAR TREND

Secret Money Power Behind Scene Forced British War Choice

(Story on Page 9)

Let's Now Get Down To National Defense!

(Page 3)

Father Coughlin's Critics Still Fail to Score

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ SENATOR LEE'S MONEY BILL ★ FRICTION IN THE AXIS

Dinner Chat

Two-Gun Mothers

THE *Philadelphia Record* (Nov. 11th) ran a story captioned *"Million Women Under Arms (Not in 'Em) Is Leader's Goal."*

Here it is:

"The most militant woman in the United States will make a speech at 2:30 P.M. today in the Broadway Hotel.

"She is Mrs. Virginia Nowell, national commander of the Green Guards of America.

"What makes her the most militant woman in the country is her expressed purpose of having 1-million women under arms—not in them—by July.

Wants to Fight

"'If there's going to be a war, we intend to have a fighting part in it,' she explained.

"Her mission in Philadelphia is to organize a post of her guards. She claims there are 52 posts already in existence, with the one in Washington, D. C., the furthest advanced.

"The guards, dressed in green overseas caps, green zipper jackets and green trousers, are taught rifle shooting, practical soldiering, building air raid shelters and a number of other blitzkrieg arts.

Have Anthem, Too

"Among other things learned by the guards is its anthem, part of which runs:

'Guard our lands, our homes and young ones;

'Blast to hell invading wrong ones . . .'

"Mrs. Nowell, buxom 48-year-old mother of two grown boys, one in the Army Air Force, declares her organization pays its way by buying uniforms wholesale and selling them retail. When a city has 250 members, she says, the national organization gives it a $500 rifle range, complete with guns and ammunition.

"'Our ultimate goal,' she says, 'is to have the Government recognize us as a woman's national guard.'"

* * *

In our opinion the mothers of America will not assimilate the Amazonian philosophy modernly expressed in the above story.

Motherhood is interested in creating life—not in destroying it.

Motherhood is concerned with peace and love, not with war and hate.

Possibly the leader responsible for the two-gun propaganda, more notorious for its grotesqueness than for reflecting the ordinary sentiments of American womanhood, will give an idea to the homemakers, the life-creators and the peace lovers to organize quietly in their sodalities, sororities, leagues and tea circles to build up a better America—an America free from the virus of war-mongering.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.

Just living annual wage.

Nationalization of important public resources.

Private ownership of all other property.

Control of private property for public good.

Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.

Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.

Cost of living maintained on an even keel.

Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.

Labor's right to organize.

Recall of non-productive bonds.

Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.

Simplification of Government and lower taxes.

Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.

Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE, National Weekly. Copyrighted 1940 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed, all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 6 November 25, 1940 No. 22

Rochester, N. Y. Has an Idea

TO THE EDITOR
OF SOCIAL JUSTICE:

AT a board of director's meeting of the Social Justice Club of Rochester, it was decided that inasmuch as there are no more broadcasts, it might be a better idea if the Club would concentrate on getting subscriptions to SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine.

So it was recommended that whenever funds were over and above expenses this money would be put into 4 or 6 month subscriptions and given to members of the Club, with a recommendation that if they are already subscribers, they would give it to somebody who is not now getting the magazine.

You may use this letter in SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine if you wish, in order to pass this idea on to any others who might like to try a similar method of getting new readers for SOCIAL JUSTICE.

—Social Justice Club of Rochester

Hollyhocks

"THAT Is a pretty story which has come up from Alto Pass, down in the Illinois Ozarks, about the hollyhocks which a slave girl named Priscilla planted more than a century ago," the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* relates.

"The girl was a quadroon, born on a Carolina plantation and sold at the age of 9 to a well-to-do Cherokee. He took her to the Great Smoky Mountains, where she planted by her tepee a packet of hollyhock seeds which she had brought from the plantation. They grew and bloomed and, when the tribe came West, she carried still another handful in her apron pocket.

"Frozen creeks halted the caravan near Jonesboro in the winter of 1838; there she was bought by Basil Silkwood of Mulkeytown, who later set her free along with other slave children.

"To show her appreciation, the girl planted the seeds near the house of her benefactor, and for 102 years they have come up, blazed red and pink and flame, seeded themselves and come up again.

"That is the story. And now seeds from the first flowers planted by the slave girl have been scattered by hollyhock lovers in a mass seeding of more than 300 miles of roadside in Southern Illinois. Yes, a pretty story, but no prettier than the prospect of mile on mile of winding highways lined with tall spikes of swaying color in Ozark Junes to come."

Congratulations for a Golden Wedding!

HELLO FOLKS:

How are y' this fine day? Yes, it is a fine day 'n a gala one at our house 'cause t'day's *the* day we've all looked forward t' f'r so long 'n got th' place all fixed up skrumpshus t' selebrate.

Golden weddin' annaversaries don't come more'n once in most peepuls' lives, I guess, 'n Mother 'n Dad Coughlin 're one uv th' lucky ones. So t'day we offer them our congratulations 'n best wishes.

We all owe 'em a lot, don't we, f'r sharin' their one 'n only son with all uv us, 'n we hope that they'll have menny more years t'gether t' enjoy life out here in th' shadow uv the Shrine.

We're all so 'xcited t'day—y' c'n well emajun. Th' whole Coughlin Clan 'n 'th Mahoneys 'n th' Cronins 'n so on down th' line 're here—it would make y'r head dizzy t' try t' count 'em all. It'll be a wunder if I don't start talkin' with a bit uv a brough myself, it's been flying so thick 'n fast around here this day.

Well, Mother 'n Dad look fine, they do, 'n are asmilin' as happy's c'n be, 'n th' house looks grand, too, all decked out with our new fixin's 'n golden flowers all over th' place.

They had th' weddin' servuce all over again—so I hear—I wasn't permittud th' pleshure uv witnessin' it, uv course. But I guess it was very nice. Then th' imediyute fam'ly—which, as I said before, is quite a gatherin' all by themselves, had brekfast at th' inn akross th' street. That gave th' ladies at th' house time t' get ev'rythin' redy f'r th' shindig in th' afternoon, when ev'rybuddy was welkome t' come 'n wish my folks th' best uv ev'rythin'.

What a day! Golly, it seems like's if we're kep' all keyed up f'r some rezon 'r other all th' time, doesn't it?

I hadda sneek away from it all t' kollect my thoughts 'n tell y' about it. Th' day jus' wouldn't be kompleet without this littul visut, even though it hasta be a wee bit shorter'n ushul.

Ev'rybuddy is havin'. a free day in oner uv th' okashun, so I hadda grab my sekratary outta th' krowd t' get this out f'r me 'n I know very well she's none too pleezed about it, either.

But there's Daddy Schwartz t' think uv, y' know 'n his Deadline 'n so we hafta mix a littul work with pleshure.

I had her get out th' reports f'r me. Looks like we've got lotsa rezuns f'r feelin' good t'day. What with ev'rybuddy at home in fine helth 'n spiruts 'n all th' books 'n reports showin' th' right color, I've got lots t' be thankful f'r.

Well, I must be runnin along now. I'm sorry t' dash in 'n out again like this, but I know y'll unnerstand how 'tis. We don't wanna miss out on too much uv th' celebratin' y' know.

So goodbye now. I'll tell y' th' rest uv th' news next week.

—Pete

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name _____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

Hitler—Molotov

SOVIET PREMIER and Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov was closeted, as you know, with Germany's Hitler to discuss what may turn out to be one of the most momentous coalitions in modern history.

What transpired at the meeting is knowledge to them and surmise to us.

As far as surmise is concerned, we suspect that Russia and Germany have come to an agreement on the post-war division of Europe.

As specified by Father Coughlin more than a year ago, Germany has at last been driven into Russia's arms — or *vice versa* — thanks to the stupidity, the blundering, and the greed of those who control the destinies of the erstwhile democracies.

Recollect that Heinrich Bruening, once Chancellor of Germany and now a refugee in America, petitioned the French government for a meager loan to be used in stemming the onrush of the Marxian wave which then promised to engulf Berlin.

Recollect that the French government refused to recognize the Chancellor's petition.

Then came the revolution in Germany.

Then came the march of the Black Shirts to power.

Then came the gradual dismemberment of the irrational *Treaty of Versailles.*

Then came the juggernaut of German military might.

Then came Munich.

Then came Poland.

Then came the conflagration which promises, before it will have been spent, to singe the whiskers from the placid jowls of Uncle Sam.

* * *

Germany was the largest and most populous Christian nation in Europe.

Despite this boast, it became a prey to the materialism of the market, of the press, of the banking house and of the cinema.

Possibly, had Leo XIII's encyclical of 1884 been taken more seriously by German ecclesiastics; possibly, had German Christianity's united voice protested more vehemently against the iniquities and inequalities of the *Versailles Treaty*, the inevitable would not have happened.

But all that is Rhine water under the bridge.

Thus, we are faced with the stark reality of a Russo-German coalition.

It will be a coalition built upon the structure of Marxism.

And what is Marxism?

It is a materialistic concept of life — a concept indifferent to, and oblivious of, the spiritual.

It is a concept more concerned with food, shelter and clothing — with temporal prosperity — than with faith, hope and charity — or with eternal salvation.

It is a concept which ridicules — if not in word at least in deed — the supreme authority of God and the supreme kingship of Christ, preferring to them the supreme authority of the State and the supreme kingship of a political party whose leader is a dictator.

Prior to 1914 the social order needed reconstruction.

As early as 1891, Leo XIII re-stated the fundamentals upon which the framework of solid reconstruction could rest.

Forty years later, his successor, Pius XI, re-affirmed all that Leo XIII said and specified the Christian principles of social reconstruction.

Viewing matters as they now stand, there is little hope that the social order will be reconstructed on Christian principles as long as world conditions are as they are.

But there will be a social reconstruction, nevertheless.

The old social order *has passed.*

To say that it *is passing* is an understatement.

The old social order — identified with European democracy, European imperialism, European capitalism and European secret societyism — was productive of want in the midst of plenty, of unemployment, of slums, of concentrated wealth and of premeditated wars.

That old social order was in its death struggle during the first World War.

That old social order actually died and will be buried following the second World War.

But the new social order, where the State is god, will flourish for a while, deceiving, if possible, even the elect.

How many years will elapse before the new social order will rise and fall is a matter for any person's speculation.

But it will be so. Doubt it not: It will be so.

"Without Me you can do nothing," said Christ.

Since the new social order has ostracized Christ, it will accomplish just nothing — nothing more and nothing less.

Then will come either another tremendous let-down — materialism will fail and an upsurge towards establishing the kingdom of Christ on this earth will be evident.

Meanwhile, let Christians take heart to prepare for that day.

* * *

Molotov's meeting with Hitler marks the melting together of two branches of Marxism, which is nothing more than anti-Christianity.

When will the leaders of Christianity merge their forces under one common creed, under one common leader, under one common cause?

Incidentally, we make bold to predict that unless the spiritual concept of life plays the major part in our American program of national defense, the United States, too, will succumb to the blandishments of materialistic Marxism.

At the outset, we repeat, Father Coughlin described this as Josef Stalin's war — meaning a war in which Marxian principles would predominate.

Today, that same observation holds good.

Index to Comment

Hitler-Molotov; Let's Get Down to National Defense ..... **Page 3**

Lord Lothian Will Win; 'Wolf! Wolf!' A Reader's Answer to 'Detroit News' Commentator ..... **Page 4**

Ambassador Kenndy Says 'Yes,' Ambassador Kennedy Says 'No'; 40-Hour Week, Farewell; 'Oh, Happy Day!'; Sir Norman Angell—Jews—Great Britain ..... **Page 5**

Editorials: Fifty-fifty; The 'Catholic Mirror'; Father Gillis, C.S.P. ..... **Page 6**

Father Coughlin 28, Critics 0; Zionists; National Unity?; Unholy Alliance; The 'Hobo News'; Defection ..... **Page 7**

Loyal Opposition; Paul Mallon Cracked Down; The British Want Us in Their War; Rabbi Wise ..... **Page 8**

Behind the War—Great Britain Chose It; A Monetary Revolt; Dr. J. S. Barnes **Page 9**

Communism in the Army; Karl von Wiegand; Why Coddle Russia? ..... **Page 10**

Neutral Ship Maneuvers; Merchant Marine; Multiple Enemies ..... **Page 11**

When America Gives; Priests in Germany; New Japanese Move ..... **Page 12**

Friction in the Axis; The Spectre of Famine; The Red Shield ..... **Page 13**

General Hugh Johnson Eats Crow; It's Still Roosevelt; What a Question!; Ireland and the War ..... **Page 14**

Senator Lee's Money Bill; So, It's Democracy; Time for a Check-up ..... **Page 15**

Father Lord Questions Einstein; Where Do Catholics Live?; Archbishop Mannix ..... **Page 19**

Will Britain Win? ..... **Page 20**

Let's Get Down to National Defense

AIRPLANES, cannons, shrapnel and gun powder possess no more strength than the moral fibre of the men who manage them.

National defense must begin with the personal straightening out of every American — a moral straightening out, if you please.

Let's get God back into our hearts.

Let's get God back into our homes.

Let's get God back into our schools.

Let's put God into the factories, warehouses and Government buildings.

In the current concept of democracy, no value is placed on a man's attitude towards his God.

But, in the true concept of democracy, it stands or falls in proportion to the ratio of its citizens who are pro-God, not only in word but in deed.

Ungodly men perform ungodly acts, as a rule, independent of their resolution to act contrariwise.

Therefore, national defense begins with a re-affirmation of our pro-Godliness.

Without God there is no honesty worth while.

Without God there is no honesty worth while.

Without God there is no patriotism worth while.

Without God each man tries to play God, or else a group of men who have risen to power constitute themselves the god of the State.

Let's be sensible about national defense.

Spiritual values are more important than material values in trying to keep America for Americans.

Comment

Lord Lothian Will Win

TO INFORMED persons the plea made by Lord Lothian to substitute "credit and carry" for "cash and carry" (November 15) was not startling.

It did recall, however, the controversy which engaged the attention of the American radio audience during the discussion of the *Neutrality Act* many months ago.

On that occasion Father Coughlin, among others, predicted that should America adopt the principle of "cash and carry," this soon would evolve into the malpractice on "credit and carry."

Recently — just preceding Lord Lothian's plea — Ambassador Joseph Kennedy played the role of a political John the Baptist in preparing the way for Lord Lothian's gospel.

It was Mr. Kennedy who theorized, in a since-repudiated statement, to the effect that any and all monies we expend in aiding Great Britain could be marked down to the account of "National Insurance."

Scarcely had this precursorial pronouncement been made by the refugee Ambassador than Lord Lothian says that England needs United States credit to be sure of victory in war.

In our opinion, these credits will be extended *no later than the end of March, 1941!*

Disregarding the billions of dollars Great Britain now owes the American people; disregarding the fact that these unpaid dollars are being sustained by the taxpayers of the United States; more billions of dollars will be siphoned from the pay envelopes, the profits and the natural resources of this nation for the benefit of Great Britain.

* * *

There is little use on the part of adversaries to oppose this policy.

The *time for opposition passed when Father Coughlin and his contemporaries tried to warn the American public of what was in the offing.*

But there is some use in preparing ourselves against the day as well as we can; for "the day," translated in the language of economics, means the appearance of a type of inflation.

Dollars will be multiplied by the Government.

In the beginning, a false prosperity will make its appearance through the agency of fat pay envelopes, bloated stocks, dropsical profits and costly commodities.

And all this at the expense of borrowed dollars which the Government will pour into the nation's money stream — borrowed dollars issued by the Federal Reserve Banks with the understanding that the taxpayers will meet their debt obligations in days to come.

* * *

Of course, like every other war, this war will have its end.

And, like every other aftermath of war, this war will have its depression.

Then will arise the question of how and when the debts contracted to conduct the war will be paid.

Definitely, England will not be able to pay because England is practically bankrupt at the moment.

England will require all her available billions of dollars to reconstruct her maimed merchant fleet, her razed cities and her crippled factories.

Will the American people be expected to pay super-taxes in a period of unemployment, deflation, and post-war turmoil?

Were Father Coughlin on the air next Sunday, likely, he would point out these gray, gruesome truths.

As usual, he would look ahead two or four years beyond the horizon of his audience — and his critics.

And he might plead with us to recapture our sanity even now, before the repudiation of all debts and the confiscation of all public utilities will be clamored for by 1946.

If he does not say so, at least his friends may say that the Pastor of the Shrine of the Little Flower told you so, having predicted that "cash and carry" would degenerate into "credit and carry" by the end of March.

And "credit and carry" will certainly degenerate into repudiation of debts and economic revolution.

'Wolf, Wolf!'

THE NEW DEAL'S success at the polls has been interpreted by the Roosevelt forces as a victory of the "common people" over Wall Street and the money interests.

If that is so, why did the Roosevelt fold include such figures as Henry Morgenthau, Sr., Barnard Baruch, Joseph P. Kennedy, and James Cromwell?

Mr. Morgenthau, Sr., made his millions in real estate in New York City.

Mr. Baruch became a millionaire by speculating in copper during the first World War.

Mr. Kennedy pyramided his small savings into a fortune on the stock market.

Mr. Cromwell is no pauper. The son of one of the world's richest mothers, Mrs. Stotesbury, he married one of the world's richest daughters, Doris Duke.

Another of President Roosevelt's chief monetary supporters was Floyd Odlum, head of Atlas Corp., one of the largest financial combines in the United States.

As a utilities king and a holding company tycoon, Mr. Odlum has control over about $700-million more than Wendell Willkie!

If there was any battle between financial interests in the recent campaign, it was between *speculative* and *productive* wealth.

The *big money earners* were for Willkie; the *big money changers* were for Roosevelt.

And, as usual, those who owned the gold triumphed over those who owned the factories.

A Reader Answers Detroit News Commentator

TO THE EDITOR:

Your recent item on W. K. Kelsey, *Detroit News* commentator, provoked me to respond to his comments to Mr. Gervais. Below is a copy of the letter which I thought might contain interest for you:

"Dear Mr. Kelsey:

"Recently I read in the magazine, SOCIAL JUSTICE, your advice to Mr. Gervais. I respect your sincerity. In fact, I've observed that it has often led you to support your convictions even when it meant having the ignominy of 'Nazi' flung at you. In that, you have my admiration.

"I cannot agree with your reasoning, however, when you blame Christian teaching for the actions of some Christians. As well blame graft, corruption, and the like on our *Constitution* and our laws and traditions as hold Christianity responsible for their misconduct.

"I believe in Christianity. That men over the world are apparently forsaking it is no indication of its failure. It is, however, an indication of *their* failure.

"I think you believe in democracy. I know most of our people do. But the world is far from accepting its principals today. Is that an indication of its failure? We say "No." We still hold a preference for it. We blame other countries for abandoning it.

"I understand which God Mr. Gervais is talking about. You must be reasonably certain yourself, if you have had any acquaintance with Christianity. But had you never heard His name, had you never heard enunciated His principles, you'd still strive after God. (Yes, Mr. Gervais' God.) Because you want perfection, Mr. Kelsey, and God is perfection.

"I deduce from your letter that you have been college educated, and in the process substituted new beliefs for some of the old ones. Why did you do that, Mr. Kelsey? You wanted a more perfect knowledge, didn't you? You had a desire for knowing the truth, didn't you? And I know you still have it. And you'll search for it down through the days of your life. You'll reject some beliefs, hold some new ones, grasp for more. Yes, and you'll never be satisfied till you reach the source of truth for which your soul was made — ours and Mr. Gervais' Christian God.

"No doubt the professional doubters, pessimists, calamity howlers and drummers of doom, and I don't believe you're among them, would sneer at that statement—that our aspirations were given so that they may be fulfilled.

"And do you think that when we have instincts, desires for truth, beauty, for love, that there is no source for their fulfillment? An inexhaustible source, I mean. We can fulfill those desires partially here in this world, but no love here is perfect, no beauty is lasting, no truth revealing enough. Those we love today may spurn us tomorrow, what we thought beautiful one time may arouse only our disgust another, the truths we hold are often overshadowed by greater ones.

"Of course, the Christian believes, where the beast is satisfied and its fulfillment attained in this world because it was made for this world, man was made finally for the world in which God exists. Therefore, the Christian says, 'I shall never be completely satisfied until I reach it.'

"The non-believer says, in effect, 'I want happiness, or satisfaction. I believe only in this world at hand.' And he goes from one thing to another searching happiness. And as the things of this world were made for time, so like time, they waste in his hands. And his only desert is frustration. He has no true peace like the Christian whose faith is a true measure with which to evaluate.

"In an honest spirit you asked Mr. Gervais to study pragmatism. In an honest spirit, I invite you to study that peerless philosopher, St. Thomas of Aquin.

"It was kind of you to bear with me while I attempted to give a defense of my beliefs. I know you will read them with an open mind.

"Sincerely and respectfully,

"(Signed) Lawrence W. Kiley"

Comment

Ambassador Kennedy Says 'Yes'; Ambassador Kennedy Says 'No'

LOUIS M. LYONS, *Boston Globe* writer, published an off-the-record interview—unauthorized — which he had with Joseph Kennedy.

Present was Ralph Coglan, editor of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch.*

As the world knows by this time, Mr. Kennedy was reported to have said: (1) "I'm willing to spend all I've got left to keep us out of the war; (2) there's no sense in our getting in. We'd just be holding the bag; democracy is all done . . . If we get into war it will be in this country, too."

After a lapse of 24 hours, so it is reported, Mr. Kennedy repudiated his shirt-sleeve, hip-suspender, American-cheese, apple pie interview.

Possibly, he was told to do so by Washington, or else—

So far Ralph Coglan has not been quoted.

Consequently, the Kennedy-Lyons veracity contest is just another one of those newspaper things out of which repercussions will sound louder than the shot that was heard round the world.

Likely, Mr. Kennedy did say a few words off-the-record—and he has said plenty of them before.

No well-informed person thinks that democracy is chipper-than-chip in England at the moment.

No far-sighted person believes that democracy will endure in America—if America gets into this war.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Kennedy, who thought he was amongst friends, not only let down his suspenders and ate apple pie, but also let down his hair as only Joseph, "the Great," can do.

Despite Mr. Kennedy's repudiation of the Lyons interview, one suspects that Downing Street will turn thumbs down on the versatile Irish-American who, as a matter of fact, knows more about affairs in Europe than any other American.

All of which recalls that four years ago the about-to-be-ex-ambassador wrote a book, prior to the previous presidential election, on why he would support Mr. Roosevelt.

And Joseph's son wrote a book which he called "While England Slept."

Perhaps, Mr. Kennedy and his son will combine to write a book telling us the real inside information.

Should they get around to do this we hope that there will be no pressure originating at Washington to make Joe say "Uncle."

40-Hour Week—Farewell

WRITING in the *Chicago Tribune* (November 9), Walter Trohan presents his readers with a story to the effect that labor's cherished 40-hour week is about to meet the same fate as the tradition regarding the "no third term."

From time to time certain leaders have been insisting that we must get busy 24 hours a day if we are in earnest in helping Great Britain to win the war.

Such help cannot be extended on a 40-hour week basis.

And this was predicted in SOCIAL JUSTICE months ago.

Said Walter Trohan:

"Four days after its election victory, the New Deal abandoned what it has claimed as one of its major items of social legislation — the 40-hour week.

"The War Department announced that defense orders are being rushed now without regard to limitation on fixed hours of labor. During the last two weeks of the third term campaign, President Roosevelt hailed the 40-hour week as one of the major New Deal accomplishments.

"Several months ago when the War Department ordered a lengthening of working hours with time and a half pay for overtime, the White House forced withdrawal of the order on the declaration that New Deal social advances were not to be imperiled by the defense program.

"The War Department grumbled that there were not enough skilled mechanics in the country to permit maintenance of the 40-hour week on a three shift basis.

* * *

"Assistant Secretary of War Robert Patterson said that in no case throughout the defense program, including British and Canadian orders, is delay being allowed to result from the application of the 40-hour week limitation to essential war orders or construction of army cantonments.

" 'All the arsenals and many airplane factories are now running three shifts of workers six days a week on an overtime basis,' he said, 'with the full approval of the national defense commission and the complete co-operation of union labor.'

"Workers are compensated on a time-and-one-half basis when their hours exceed 40.

"Officials said that in time all airplane factories producing orders for both American and British needs will be working on the same 24 hours a day basis.

"What Patterson had to say about production was made in a statement intended to clarify the War Department's policy, a policy which, he reminded, was patterned after the 1917 world war policy, only brought up to date.

"That policy was formulated by Congress, the President, and the defense commission on the basis of present day labor practices. It requires that the local union rate of time and a half be paid to laborers and mechanics for work in excess of eight hours in any one day in accordance with the 40-hour week. Overtime must be paid for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays in accordance with local recognized practices.

"The defense commission on September 13 ruled that in order that surplus and unemployed labor may be absorbed in the defense program, all reasonable efforts should be made to avoid hours in excess of 40 hours a week, 'except when emergency requirements compel exceptions to the rule.'

* * *

"Patterson said today that the War Department does not regard the commission's recommendation with respect to adherence to the 40-hour week as applying 'to prevent overtime work under the Department's construction program.'

"The 40-hour week limitation is frequently applied, he said, to such items as shoes, clothing, blankets, and other articles of army use made commercially. In these trades there is still a great deal of unemployed labor and unused factory space."

Oh, Happy Day!

COMMANDER Thomas D. Galbraith, member of the British Purchasing Commission, declared in Boston on November 14 that it *would be a "glorious and happy day"* in British history if this country should decide to take up arms against "the totalitarian nations."

He spoke a few hours after Navy Secretary Frank Knox told an earlier session of the New England Conference that this country would not "appease anyone on earth," and added, *"we are going to give Great Britain every possible degree of aid short of leaving ourselves defenseless."*

Sir Norman Angell—Jews—Great Britain

THE PRE-EMINENT Englishman, Sir Norman Angell, Nobel prize winner and noted author, recently identified the destiny of the Jews with Great Britain.

"The British and Jewish peoples now share the honor of being the two peoples of all the earth upon whom Hitler visits his deadliest enmity," the British speaker told 500 members of the United Palestine Appeal Conference, meeting in Washington, D. C., November 10.

He said that Nazidom had become the supreme enemy of both the British and the Jews and that if Britain were defeated there *"would not be a Jew in all the world who would not be in mortal peril."*

According to the *New York Times*, Sir Norman told the Jewish leaders that although normal shipping lanes had been blocked because of the war, 24,000 Jewish refugees had entered Palestine during the first year of the conflict through Sweden, Russia, Greece, Roumania, Turkey or Syria.

The Jewish agency for Palestine established a special immigration office in Athens which functioned up to the time of the Italian invasion of Greece. More than 7,500 Jews are still on their way to Palestine in a steady flow which has not been interrupted by the war's spread to the Mediterranean.

Many refugees have reached Palestine from Lisbon by traveling around the Cape of Good Hope to Bombay and Basra. Buses and planes take them from Germany to Lisbon.

Emphasizing its importance as a strategic point in the British line of supplies, Sir Norman stressed the fact that "Palestine has become a vital bastion in the defense not alone of Britain but of Jews the world over; and not alone of Jewry but of all free men, of human right everywhere."

"The battle of the British people, the battle of Palestine, the battle of world Jewry, the battle of the rights of Jews, for the rights of man," he said, "is now all one battle, one and indivisible."

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Fifty-Fifty

ON THE HEELS of the presidential election, Mr. Roosevelt informed the American public that it is his plan to divide our material instruments of national defense with Great Britain on a fifty-fifty basis.

Official Washington practically has accepted the theory that our first line of defense is the British Empire.

And this theory has been so ably propagandized that a majority of Americans are prone to accept it.

A moral union, therefore, is being firmly established between Great Britain and the United States.

Probably, this type of union will evolve into one that is definitely physical.

The program, possibly, which will be unfolded before the American people will result in economic parity between London and Washington; in naval, aeronautical and military cohesion between the two capitals; and, eventually, in political sympathy to the extent that both England and the United States, while praising liberty, will impose drastic discipline upon labor, agriculture, industry and commerce.

Years ago, Father Coughlin indicated publicly that there was no need for our accepting the European standard of living in America.

He pointed out that our ancestors fled Europe to escape its inequalities and social hurricanes.

And he concluded that unless we divorced ourselves from the doctrine of gold control, and private money control identified with Bank of Englandism and the empire, sooner or later we would be forced to accept the European standard of living.

The American people have chosen to follow the policies which stem from the program of fifty-fiftyism.

Its inevitable results, when they arrive, will be of our own making and, therefore, when they happen, should not find us cry babies.

The Catholic Mirror

IN ITS November issue, *The Catholic Mirror*, official organ of the diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts, writes as follows:

"All thoughtful Americans regret the silencing of Father Coughlin.

"Whether we approve of Father Coughlin's activities or not, whether we agree with his views or not, we must all admit that something has happened to American freedom of speech; that the success of the hidden forces responsible for such a violation of American rights of citizenship is a great blow to freedom.

" 'Rabble-rouser,' 'Jew-baiter,' are some of the more polite terms that are used in referring to Father Coughlin. The charge of anti-Semitism directed against him is very much open to question. Direct listening to his speeches or reading of them certainly does not support these charges.

"We remember that he was accused of attacking the Jews in one address in which we knew from having personally listened to him that he did nothing more than to read *George Washington's Farewell Address*, and in another in which we knew from similar personal experience that he did nothing more than to read the *Declaration of Independence*.

"It is true that two of his addresses in November, 1938, did earn for him the relentless enmity of influential groups. It is these groups who have been able to exclude Father Coughlin from the radio.

"Earl Browder represents the Communist Party, an anti-religious, anti-American organization. A convict, out of jail but denied permission to leave the jurisdiction of the court, Earl Browder nevertheless is permitted to speak, apparently when he wishes to do so, over a national hook-up of Columbia Broadcasting System.

"Rutherfordism, stinking with the slime of bigotry and anti-Christ, has been allowed to poison the air from coast to coast with vile radio attacks on the religious beliefs of American Catholics, Protestants and Jews. The Dies Congressional Committee definitely branded this group as a danger to American peace and unity.

"If both Earl Browder and Judge Rutherford have national hookups, why are such a pair permitted to broadcast their subversive propaganda and a great patriot and priest like Father Coughlin silenced?

"There is only one answer: Earl Browder and Judge Rutherford have a message that is more acceptable to the powers that be!"

Father Gillis, C.S.P.

IN HIS pre-election edition of *The Catholic World*, the Paulist monthly magazine, Father Gillis roundly criticized the third term and informed his readers that he was opposed to Mr. Roosevelt's re-election.

For this, many persons have aimed their darts of criticism at the eminent Paulist editor.

As a matter of fact, several Bishops also openly opposed the third term, thereby "dabbling in politics," as the critics say.

Aside from all that, we are informed by such persons as Dr. Clarence J. Enzler that politics is not the field of clergymen.

Dr. Enzler intimates that politics and morality should be separate entities.

How would the eminent Doctor characterize the bishops of Germany, for example, who opposed Hitler in 1932 and thereafter, when it was still possible to vote?

Possibly those bishops would be esteemed as heroes because they foresaw the rise of totalitarianism and the subjugation of ecclesiasticism.

If there are a few people — among them ecclesiastics — who foresee what is about to happen in the United States and now speak out fearlessly to warn the people, must they be condemned as dabblers in politics?

Possibly the day will arrive when Dr. Enzler and his type will be classified with the critics of the few German clergymen who possessed the fortitude to speak when it was possible to speak.

Comment

Fr. Coughlin 28: Critics 0

READERS of SOCIAL JUSTICE are all too familiar with the often-told story of the so-called "Jewish People's Committee" and its drive to smear and "investigate" Father Coughlin, exposed in these columns many times.

This "Jewish People's Committee," it has been revealed, was neither "Jewish, "Peoples," nor a "committee." You may remember that it has been headed by a succession of self-appointed leaders who were indicted or arrested one after another — Welwel Warzower, Ben Gold, "Jack" Spivak et al, to name three of them.

When exposure — or arrest — ended their usefulness, this trio was succeeded by a "Rabbi" Miller.

A letter in a recent edition of the *Tablet* of Brooklyn now cites, in turn, the exposure and repudiation of this leader as well.

The *Tablet* letter follows:

Rabbi Levinthal
Exposes Red Group

"Dear Sir: In the spring of this year you will recall the activities of the Jewish People's Committee in their fight on Father Coughlin. Through Rabbi Miller and others they demanded investigations, bombarded the Mayor and the press and others. Your paper carried several responses to their mean attacks and described the outfit as a Communist organization.

"There is an excellent letter from Rabbi Levinthal in tonight's *Brooklyn Eagle*. It supplies the last word on a group of Father Coughlin's critics. The letter follows:

" 'In your paper of October 9 there appeared an item concerning a demonstration of American Student Union of Brooklyn College against participation in any war. One of the speakers mentioned was "Rabbi Moses Miller of the Jewish People's Committee of 300,000."

" 'This requires a correction. Moses Miller is not a member of any recognized rabbinical body. This was confirmed by the New York Board of Jewish Ministers, by the Brooklyn Board of Jewish ministers, by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of United States and Canada, and by the Rabbinical Board of New York.

" 'Mr. Miller's only claim to the rabbinate was his service as minister of the Millinery Center Synagogue of 1011 6th Ave., Manhattan. Upon becoming the president of the Jewish People's Committee, one of the numerous "decoys" of the Communist party, he was obliged to resign.

" 'Since then, an inquiry has been set afoot to ascertain whether Mr. Miller is a graduate of any of the recognized rabbinical schools or seminaries, or has been otherwise properly ordained for the rabbinate.

" 'As to the 300,000 which the Jewish People's Committee is supposed to represent, it will suffice to say that according to the authoritative statement of the magazine *Fortune* there are altogether 3,500 to 4,000 Jewish members in the Communist party. Allowing for "pinkish" sympathizers, known as fellow-travelers, to double or treble this, the claim is preposterous beyond words.

" 'As a matter of fact, the so-called Jewish People's Committee has been repudiated by every recognized Jewish body in America.

" 'Rabbi ISRAEL H. LEVINTHAL,
President.

" 'Brooklyn Jewish Community Council.'

"I am yours truly,
JOSEPH L. TURNER,
Brooklyn, N. Y."

And so, in current football parlance, the score at the end of the half now stands:

Father Coughlin 28: Jewish People's Committee 0.

Zionists

ACCORDING to the *New York Times* of November 6, a nation-wide campaign for new members will be conducted by the Zionist Organization of America from now to December 25.

The organization has set a goal of 150,000 new members. The drive will end with special celebrations during Chanukah week, December 25 to January 1.

During the campaign, public rallies and other events will be held in hundreds of Jewish communities under the auspices of local Zionist organizations. Mr. Edmund I. Kaufmann, president of the society, emphasized the necessity for strengthening the Zionist ranks and appealed for unity in the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home in Palestine.

"The times are too serious, the needs are too urgent," said Mr. Kaufmann. "Every ounce of our strength and energy, every power we possess must be directed at constructive work to fill the needs of Yishuv. We have entered upon a new phase of the Zionist movement in America. We have reached the day when we must make American Jewry understand that Palestine and the Jewish future in Palestine is the concern not merely of Zionists but of every Jew in America."

* * *

It is a pity that Christians, too, are not inspired by their leaders to start a movement paralleling that of the Jews—but for a different purpose.

We do not consider the Jews "anti-Christian" in their endeavor to restore Palestine to Jewry.

Jews should not consider Christians "anti-Semitic" in endeavoring to restore to Christ countries founded by Christians.

National Unity?

THE *Detroit Jewish Chronicle* is certainly plugging for national unity.

In its post-election edition this carefully edited, super-charitable journal prints the following:

"What about Hugh Johnson? Will he continue to pollute his columns with smears against Jews and others on religious and racial lines? What about John L. Lewis? Will he resign, or will he do a Coughlin somersault, first threatening to resign and then nonchalantly changing his mind? Will the C.I.O. rank and file hold him to his word? If he is held to his word, perhaps the ultimate peace in the labor movement will result in one of the greatest triumphs of this election."

As a matter of fact, Father Coughlin was more interested in fishing during this late lamented campaign than he was in selling the eye-wash of politics.

Unholy Alliance

ELEVEN MORE Christian and Jewish ministers came out with a manifesto last week urging America to withhold food from starving Europe.

This in itself was not news.

But what was news is the fact that the statement was sent out to the newspapers under the name of "Ulric Bell."

Mr. Bell is a newspaperman and, as far as this writer could ascertain, has no connection with any church or sect.

Just why he should suddenly start circulating such statements of some obscure ministers is not clear.

What is clearer, however, is that Mr. Bell is a close friend of Secretary of State Cordell Hull and served as press advisor to the Secretary on two of his South American tours.

It remains obscure, however, why Christian charity should find its sturdiest opponents among reputed clergymen.

'Hobo News'

AMERICA'S larger cities have lately become well accustomed to hawkers selling a publication called *"The Hobo News."*

The paper's circulation has reportedly passed the 100,000 mark, due to such provoking headlines as "The *Hell with Hitler.*"

The mystery of our hoboes' sudden interest in international politics was lessened last week when the editor wrote a letter to selective service officials asking a few questions about the draft.

The editor's name: J. Leon Lazarowitz.

Defections

A BREAKDOWN of the recent election returns in New York City shows that, with the exception of the Jewish districts, the non-Anglo-Saxon element is turning away from the New Deal.

In the 16th district, on Manhattan's East Side, ardent New Dealer James H. Fay lost his Congressional seat to an obscure Republican named William Pfeiffer.

Fay's defeat was reportedly due to the defection of thousands of Irish Catholics who have become thoroughly aroused at the President's exaggerated pro-Britishism.

In the Tammany-controlled 2nd assembly district in New York, Mr. Roosevelt had only a 2,100 plurality as compared with his 14,000-vote plurality four years ago.

The "2nd A.D." is chiefly populated by Italians and Irish.

In the almost solidly Irish 12th, Mr. Roosevelt had a plurality of only 278. In this same district the President beat Landon by a majority of 14,000 in 1936.

Voters of German descent expressed their anti-Roosevelt feelings by cutting down the President's 1936 plurality of 26,000 in Yorkville to a bare 4,000.

In the Ridgewood section in Queens, the German-American populace shaved Roosevelt's 1936 plurality of 3 to 1 to a scant majority of 3,650 out of a total of 85,000 votes.

The 3rd and 9th, predominantly Italian, switched from the Democratic to the Republican column.

Only in New York's Jewish districts did President Roosevelt keep the same large pluralities he held in 1936.

The 4th A.D. on the Lower East Side went Roosevelt by a score of 14,381 to 1,298.

Other Jewish districts voted for Roosevelt in a like proportion.

Comment

'Loyal Opposition'

"A VITAL element in the balanced operation of democracy is a strong, alert and watchful opposition," said Mr. Wendell Willkie in his Nov. 12th address to the nation.

That, he added, is our task for the next four years.

"We must constitute ourselves a vigorous, loyal and public-spirited opposition party."

The "opposition" leader continued:

"It has been suggested that in order to present a united front to a threatening world, the minority should now surrender its convictions and join the majority. This would mean that in the United States of America there would be only one dominant party — only one economic philosophy — only one political philosophy of life.

"This," Willkie objected, "is a totalitarian idea — it is a slave idea — it must be rejected utterly . . .

"Our American unity cannot be made with words or gestures. It must be forged between the ideas of the opposition and the practices and policies of the administration.

"Ours is a Government of principles and not one merely of men. Any member of the minority party, though willing to die for his country, still retains the right to criticize the policies of the Government. This right is imbedded in our constitutional system.

"We, who stand ready to serve our country behind our commander-in-chief, nevertheless retain the right, and I will say the duty, to debate the course of our Government . . .

"Therefore, to you who have so sincerely given yourselves to this cause, which you chose me to lead, I say: 'Your function during the next four years is that of the loyal opposition.'

"You believe deeply in the principles that we stood for in the recent campaign. And principles are not like football suits to be put on in order to play a game and then taken off when the game is over.

"It is your constitutional duty to debate the policies of this or any other administration and to express yourselves freely and openly to those who represent you in your state and national Government.

* * *

"Under our philosophy, the primary purpose of government is to serve its people and to keep them from hurting one another. For this reason our Federal Government has regulatory laws and commissions.

"For this reason we must fight for the rights of labor, for assistance to the farmer, and for protection for the unemployed, the aged and the physically handicapped.

"But while our Government must thus regulate and protect us, it must not dominate our lives.

"We, the people are the masters. We, the people, must build this country. And we, the people, must hold our elected representatives responsible to us for the care they take of our national credit, our democratic institutions and the fundamental laws of our land.

"Two days after the election," Mr. Willkie went on, "Administration recommended that the nation debt limit be increased from $49-billion to $65-billion.

"Immediately after that announcement, prices on the New York Stock Exchange and other exchanges jumped sharply upward. This is not a sign of health, but a sign of fever. Those who are familiar with these things agree that the announcement of the Treasury indicated a danger — sooner or later — of inflation.

* * *

"No man can say exactly how big the national debt can become, before causing serious inflation. But some sort of limit certainly exists, beyond which lies financial chaos.

"Such chaos would inevitably mean the loss of our social gains, the destruction of our savings, the ruin of every little property owner, and the creation of vast unemployment and hardships. It would mean, finally, the rise of dictatorship.

"Those have been the results of financial collapse in every country in the history of the world. The only way that we can avoid them is to remain sound and solvent.

"It is not incumbent upon any American to remain silent concerning such a danger. I shall not be silent and I hope you will not be."

Paul Mallon Cracked Down

RECENTLY (November 8th) the White House barred Paul Mallon, nationally known columnist, from presidential press conferences.

According to the journalist, he was being punished for inaccuracies.

Mr. Roosevelt, reading a Mallon contribution observed certain statements such as "New Deal circles" were reporting that some changes in the Cabinet are likely; "it was said in official quarters that the resignation of Col. Henry L. Stimson, as Secretary of War, would be accepted by the President."

Mr. Roosevelt said as a matter of fact the report was not circulated in New Deal circles; nor was it said in official quarters.

Very likely, Mr. Mallon has been guilty of many inaccuracies. In this he is no exception in so far as practically every newspaper columnist deserves the same criticism — including ourselves.

After some delay, Mr. Mallon was permitted to return to White House conferences.

The whole affair is a straw in the wind of current happenings.

From now on one can expect to witness the growth of a modified censorship to control those particular correspondents who make Washington and Government circles their beat.

To what extent this censorship will develop remains for future analysists to decide.

While fair-minded persons do not resent the appearance of this new practice, nevertheless, it might be in order for them to ask who will censor the censors?

Who will censor the propaganda emanating from men more important than Mallon — William Allen White, for example, who is advocating "union now" with Great Britain?

The British Want Us in Their War

JUST RETURNED from Britain where he has served as foreign correspondent since the start of the war, William Stoneman of the *Chicago Daily News* says the British assurances that America will not be called upon to join the conflict, are "just so much bunk."

Mr. Stoneman lists four important reasons why British leaders are striving to entangle the United States in the European conflict.

(1) Britain needs such an overwhelming amount of first-class war materials in order to carry on the war that only official United States participation can make Americans produce the required armament.

(2) Britain can not continue much longer to carry the enormous expense of its struggle against Germany alone. The United States must be called in, in order *to help pay the bill.*

(3) Britain needs badly, various types of naval vessels and aircraft in the possession of the American armed forces — types which the American public would only be willing to give to Britain after a military alliance.

(4) An American declaration of war against Germany would bolster Britain's declining morale and restore her world prestige.

The last point, Mr. Stoneman feels, is the most important.

If the British could get America to declare war, they hope that Soviet Russia would waver in its tie to Germany; that the populations of the Nazi-conquered nations would attempt to revolt; and that the bombed and blasted citizens of London and other English cities would continue to undergo their frightful suffering without a murmur.

Mr. Stoneman doesn't dare write about the methods the British are employing to get us into the war. If he did, he would be accused of being a "Nazi."

He does, however, give us the reasons the British want us in, and he successfully destroys the "phony" propaganda that all they want of America is armaments and munitions.

Rabbi Wise

SOME newspapers throughout the country have been a bit liberal in their declaration that since President Roosevelt was re-elected, therefore, his foreign policy of all aid to Britain was approved by the American people.

The fallacy of this reasoning has been challenged in several quarters.

Obviously, the American people were not given a chance to vote on aid to Britain, since Mr. Roosevelt's opponent also advocated that aid.

Agreement with this view comes from a rather unexpected quarter, albeit in a somewhat negative and ambiguous manner.

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, who has always been a staunch supporter of President Roosevelt, told a regular Town Hall Club audience last week:

"The country might have been divided if Mr. Willkie had said he was against any foreign entanglements, or against aid to Britain, or against any Asiatic involvement.

"I believe Mr. Willkie might have been elected *if he had resorted to such unworthy statements.*"

In one breath Rabbi Wise admits that the majority of Americans would probably vote for American isolation from European wars, and then designates such isolationist views as "unworthy."

Behind the War

Great Britain Chose It

FOR YEARS before the outbreak of the war, there were three possible foreign policies between which Great Britain might have made her choice.

The first was the policy of the war-mongers—composed for the most part of ambitious, out-of-work politicians like Mr. Churchill, behind whom were the moneyed interests. These interests were dismayed by the steady progress of the new system of political economics, which was gradually liberating the Continent of Europe from their servitude, and who realized that in war lay their only hope of continuing in control.

Some members of this group wanted war immediately, confident that the power of money and of blockade were sufficient to insure victory.

Others wanted first to carry through a program of armaments. All were united, however, in their insistence on war at whatever psychological moment appeared most propitious.

* * *

The second policy was the one actually attempted—and, given the influences behind the scenes, it led in the end to the same results.

It was the policy of woolly-minded idealists, like Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Lord Halifax, who were on the one hand afraid of war, and, on the other, were anxious—in their self-righteous hypocrisy—to create a reputation for Britain as a power which would never wish to hurt even a fly.

They were flanked by a host of ideological fanatics, like Lord Cecil, and exploited by crafty politicians like Lord Baldwin and Mr. Eden, whose chief preoccupation consisted in the electoral successes of their party. They played up to the pacifist tendencies of a large section of organized public opinion; and perverted the League of Nations into an instrument for maintaining the *status quo*, and of relieving the British taxpayer from paying a bigger armaments bill.

When Italy broke the power of the League, the late Mr. Chamberlain took over the command and sincerely tried to promote a policy of appeasement by means of a series of small concessions (and promises of concessions) to Italy and Germany.

This policy, however, was equally futile. It could only lead to the undermining of British prestige—for the simple reason that small concessions were not enough.

Moreover, it played fatally into the hands of the war-mongers. The British public became exasperated by the continual crises and the progressive loss of British prestige. Public opinion was consequently jockeyed into the position of acquiescing in war as the only way out of a demoralizing situation, which was made to appear an *impasse*.

* * *

The third policy—which was never tried, but which, if it had been tried would have saved the situation—was the one advocated by Sir Oswald Mosley.

He realized from the outset that great vital States like the German and the Italian, with populations greater than those of Britain and France, still growing in numbers and representing civilizations no less important and creative, needed in justice to be brought into equal partnership with Britain and France both as colonial powers and world influences.

He realized that a victorious war would solve no problems. It woud only lead to the bolshevization of half of Europe, and fasten the heel of the money lenders all the more firmly on the necks of the rest.

He likewise realized that to give way to pressure by means of progressive concessions would only ruin British prestige and undermine British morale.

Consequently, Sir Oswald Mosley advocated boldly grasping the nettle of great sacrifices and of thereby taking the lead in a reconstruction of Europe and of colonial possessions, and of liberating Europe in cooperation with Germany and Italy from the incubus of the money power.

Such a policy, of course, implied serious sacrifices of British and French territory. The sacrifices needed, however, were much smaller than those which would have inevitably resulted from a war, which, if it were to be victorious, would have to be a long and bloody one.

Sir Oswald Mosley was not listened to. Instead, he is in jail; so are Mrs. Mosley and 900 of his followers!

The result is the awful scene of misery and destruction which the English people have at last been brought to share with the wretched Poles, Belgians and French.

Half the Empire must now, inevitably, be lost. All, indeed, that can be said from the British point of view in favor of the present situation is this:

Maybe this war will not have been fought in vain, despite defeat and colossal loss, if Britain is liberated in the end from the tyranny of the moneyed interests; and if the foundations of a united Europe, enjoying the wide vital spaces of Africa, the Near East and part of the Middle East, can be firmly laid.

Dr. J. S. Barnes

IN A RECENT letter from our eminent European correspondent, Dr. J. S. Barnes writes:

"Do not be taken in by the blasphemy, which is constantly repeated by our hypocritical tyrants, namely, that Britain is engaged in a crusade—that she is fighting in the cause of Christianity."

The letter adds:

"There still exists a lot of prejudice against Catholics in England. For 400 years England has done all she could to fight, discredit and disrupt the Church.

"All the same, it can hardly be denied that Catholics are Christians, or even that Catholicism is the very center of Christianity. There are, for example, more Catholics in the world than all the other Christian sects put together.

"When the last Pope denounced certain people and certain ideas in Nazi Germany, the very same people who had backed atheism in Spain spoke of the Pope as 'a great Christian!'

"If this is not hypocrisy, I do not know what it is."

Major Barnes—or Dr. Barnes, as our readers know him best—has analyzed the international situation for the columns of this National Magazine for several years. Due to the war, his communications are necessarily intermittent.

But, as in the case of the discussion on this page, and with many another comment on foreign affairs, the background has often been supplied by the first-hand reports of this scholarly observer.

A Monetary Revolt

PARLIAMENTARY forms of government, worked by two or three strongly organized parties, and based on a widely extended and undifferentiated sufferage, has been found to lend itself, better than any other form of government, to the influence of occult forces operating from behind the scenes.

It is this peculiar characteristic of political life in Britain today that has become in recent years the decisive factor.

Parliament has in fact virtually abdicated its prerogative of government. It has sunk to becoming little more than a forum of claims. The real power reposes elsewhere.

It is the power of the "moneyed interests," represented not by the great industrialists, but by the great banks and finance houses, who have the monopoly of manufacturing and destroying credit.

These interests, though they possess no joint organization through which to dictate their will, are nevertheless the real dictators of Britain today—and yesterday.

They exercise their influence by the spontaneous pressure of their interests in maintaining, at all costs, the monetary system on which they thrive both at home and abroad, whereby they are able to dictate their will, within certain limits, to both the wage earners and the industrialists.

Though London has been their main headquarters, they acknowledge no fatherland. They are completely international in outlook.

Their "empire" is not confined to the British Empire. It extends over all the world; for they form an international body bound together by strong mutual interests and by an enormous clientele who depend on them—or imagine they do.

But, perhaps, they would not be so powerful if it were not for the existence in their midst of one well-organized international group, which, though actually a minority, may be regarded as their very center of gravity, or—to adopt another metaphor—their General Staff.

This minority is the Jews, and in particular, the great Jewish financiers.

* * *

Fascism and National Socialism is the uprising of the young vital peoples of Europe against this tyranny.

These movements are, accordingly, in their fundamental aspects, necessarily anti-liberal; for it is the liberal parliamentary forms of government that provide the conditions in which life has been controlled from behind the scenes by the international monetary interests and by the Jewish secret organizations.

Fascism and National Socialism have triumphed wherever a weak liberal tradition has existed in combination with strong vital energies and an exasperated sense of national subservience.

In Britain, however, the liberal tradition is not only deeply rooted, but has not been combined recently with either strong vital energies or with any exasperated sense of national subservience.

Britain is old and, in many respects, decadent; and she has remained the capital of the most widely flung Empire that the world has ever seen, even though it may be true that this Empire has practically ceased to be British, but has become *de facto* international.

Comment

Communism in the Army

FOR A NUMBER of years, France kidded herself along till the crash came. Then an uninformed world was shocked as it realized that, from "a breeding standpoint," France had been unable to maintain its normal population of 40-million.

Lloyd George says that in the French army that marched forth to battle there were 500,000 Communists!

"I would much rather have in my command a lad with arrested syphilis than one suffering from Communism," writes Major General George Van Horn Moseley in a letter to the editor of the *Atlanta Constitution.*

Gen. Moseley's letter was in comment upon an editorial in the *Constitution* entitled *"Are We a Flabby People?"*

"Examining surgeons are astounded today as they find themselves compelled to reject so many lads who report for enlistment," the General wrote. "The hearts of these lads are imbued with the right spirit, but their bodies are defective.

"All statistics show that we are in worse shape today than we were in 1917, when we examined our lads for the World War.

"Today's press carries a statement that the Army will accept Communists, of whom the Dies Committee reports there are some 300,000 in the land.

"Never before has there been any tinge of red in the Army," Gen. Moseley asserts. "Heretofore, all efforts on the part of the Communists to bore from within have met with failure."

The letter continues:

"A school coach has no interest in the round-shouldered bookworm, the undernourished lad who may be working his way through, or the great run of the mine; his only interest is in finding a winning team.

"Chief Coach Uncle Sam is doing the same thing today. He wants fit lads for his Army team, and he will take no interest in your son, who does not measure up.

"Thus, a draft in no way benefits the average manpower of the nation. Uncle Sam leaves all the derelicts on the streets of the nation, in the hospitals, or in the homes.

"Our Commander-in-Chief, the President, is reported to have expressed surprise and disappointment that many of our soldiers in the northern maneuvers could not march. We have known that for a long time. They cannot carry a pack and undergo physical exertion in the way C.C.C. lads can.

"In 1915, I was assisting Senator Chamberlain in his efforts to put through a plan for universal military training *for every lad* —your son and mine.

"The lad was to be selected at an age just before he might go to college or enter the business world; at an age when he had no responsibilities or a wife and child; at an age when good food and regular training for a year would be very beneficial.

"The benefits proposed were to accrue to the civil life of the nation principally, and secondarily, to the solution of our problem of national defense.

"Our people could not 'take it,' and the pacifists easily defeated the plan.

"Senator Chamberlain finally expressed his conclusion on the subject in a letter addressed to me, wherein he said:

" 'Nothing on earth will drive our people to realize the importance of the subject *except an invasion by a first-class military power!'*

"I yield to no individual in love of my country as that country was envisioned fundamentally," the General concludes, "but I know only too well that our success in the future will vary directly with the character, virility, health and breeding of Mr. Average American Citizen."

Karl Von Wiegand

THE GENTLEMAN whose name captions this comment is the chief foreign correspondent for the Hearst papers.

Knowing definitely more about the war, its causes, its progress and its back-stage activities than 99 per cent of our American citizens could possibly know, he gives us this pertinent advice:

"Coming home from war-torn Europe, with its sleepless nights, and its insomnia of dread, fear and terror, I expected to find our American people the happiest on the earth, and they should be and have reason to be.

"I am bitterly disappointed.

"They seem not to know nor to appreciate the blessing of peace, security, undisturbed days and nights, and plenty to eat.

"I am told, and I cannot believe it, that they want to leave this truly paradisaical condition to take part in the hell of war which is no concern of theirs.

"A crosscut section of the chaotic state of thought of the American people shows them confused by every form of propaganda appealing to their every emotion and sentiment but never to their common sense.

"Their minds are focussed not on their own home and national problems but upon the problems of the people of far-away Europe and Asia. They have been told that their happiness and security lie not at home but in Europe or the Far East.

"Many even in Washington where supposedly the cream of political intelligence is concentrated, really believe America's frontiers in the East are across the Atlantic and in the other direction at British Singapore, 14,000 miles apart.

Is History Repeating?

RAY STANNARD BAKER, in his biography of Woodrow Wilson, wrote: "Trade between the United States and the Allies had become the great artery which, flowing westward, fed American war prosperity, and, flowing eastward, sustained the life of the Allied armies and population. Diplomats and statesmen alike dreaded any policy that threatened to contract that life-giving stream . . .

"The effect of our rapidly expanding wartime trade—trade that was then perfectly legal—was to entangle us vitally with the welfare of the Allies . . .

"Thus, by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point."

"If you are for America first, last and always, you are *ipso facto* a Fifth Columnist. If you are pro-British, that is if you are for America wholly unprepared going into the war, which England declared, you are a 120 per cent American.

"England has a good cause, but it is her cause, not ours. And England's declaring war against Germany in the circumstances of her own unpreparedness, still remains a historic mystery."

Why Coddle Russia?

"RUSSIA is no better than Germany," declares an editorial in the *Daily News* of Lebanon, Pennsylvania.

"There appears to be a vast difference of opinion in the recent statements of Defense Commissioner Knudsen and President Roosevelt regarding the importance of machine tools as America sets about building its defense," the paper goes on. "Mr. Knudsen contends that these tools constitute America's No. 1 defense problem and hints that a shortage of them might impede business efforts to maintain the American standard of living. Mr. Roosevelt seems to believe that the United States can afford to supply machine tools to Russia.

"In his address before a group of top ranking industrialists in New York City, Mr. Knudsen asserted: 'If you gentlemen figure you are going to need a lot of machine tools in order to carry on your American way of life, you had better take another look. I say this frankly because I think we ought to appreciate the seriousness of the situation as far as the tools are concerned.'

"President Roosevelt, acting under a new law, has directed that an official survey be made of critical war materials, particularly machine tools, which have been ordered but not delivered to foreign powers, with a view to requisitioning those materials considered essential to American defense; and he asserted in response to questions, that his order would not preclude shipments of machine tools to Russia.

"Whatever materials could be spared in the domestic program would be made available for shipment to friendly powers, if such action was found to be in the public interest, he said, and he made it clear that he considered Russia a friendly power.

"How can these attitudes be reconciled? If machine tools are the nation's No. 1 defense problem, as Mr. Knudsen says, how can the sale of any amount of them, however small, be termed as in the public interest? Mr. Knudsen says there is such a shortage of these tools that the lack might interfere with maintaining the American standard of living.

"Is the United States going to rearm Russia, the unpredictable, blood-soaked totalitarian state, for a possible war against Japan, or is President Roosevelt more concerned about building up the Russian standard of living—whatever that may be—than he is about retaining the American standard?

"Nothing has been published about any military alliance between the United States and Russia. And Mr. Roosevelt, who professes to be perturbed about totalitarian states and so much upset over Germany's invasions of neutral states and Italy's stab in the back of France, seems unconcerned about the totalitarian Russia which seized Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, butchered countless Finns and stabbed Poland in the back.

"What gives rise to this apparent sympathy for the Soviet, even when American living standards are endangered?"

Neutral Ship Maneuvers

THE UNITED STATES Navy Department has explained that a flotilla of destroyers and Navy seaplanes, which left Key West under sealed orders and later appeared in the Caribbean, were engaged in "regular maneuvers."

Following conferences between Nazi bigwigs and representatives of Vichy, France, the United States State Department dispatched a stiff note to Marshal Petain informing him that the United States Government would not permit any transfer of the sovereignty of foreign possessions in this hemisphere.

Reports reached the State Department that some ships of the French navy, interned at Martinique, were about to make a break through the British blockade and dash for German-occupied France, or perhaps, Dakar, Africa.

The British blockading the island base are determined that the French aircraft carrier *Bearn*, with its cargo of American-made planes, must not fall into the hands of the Germans.

On the docks at the French base in Martinique, also, are at least 100 more American planes which have remained there since the collapse of France.

The United States is resolved to regain possession of these planes to sell them to the British government.

* * *

Germany has protested that America permits British men-of-war engaged in the blockade to refuel at American and hemispheric ports, in violation of the law of neutrality.

Furthermore, the Germans maintain that the British men-of-war are being constantly supplied with water, fuel and food by American carrier ships.

Of course, the Germans seem to forget that their own sea raiders, also, rely upon neutral sources for their oil, water and supplies, and that ships of the German merchant marine sailing from Central and South American ports are engaged in supplying these commerce raiders.

Moreover, the State Department has protested the presence of American ships and planes in the vicinity of Martinique, thus in effect putting both a British and American blockade on a section of the French fleet.

This gains interest in view of the reports that the French aircraft carrier *Bearn* has been observed taking aboard considerable fuel oil, as if preparing to make a dash to sea.

The Nazis say they fear that American ships will be so maneuvered between the British men-of-war and the French fleet as to prevent ships from fleeing to the open sea without passing under the guns of the lurking British war dogs.

Germany enacted the same tactical maneuver in the Mediterranean during the Nationalist-Loyalist civil war in Spain.

The raider *Deutschland* of the *Graf von Spee* class was maneuvered between a Loyalist warship and a Nationalist destroyer in the midst of a naval battle. The Loyalist battleship was forced to hold its fire for fear of hitting the *Deutschland* and the Nationalists' small ship escaped.

The Spanish Loyalists protested this German action as unneutral and belligerent; but the German foreign office pointed out that the German commander "had a right to maneuver his ship as he deemed necessary or useful, since his ship belonged to a non-warring nation."

Would the Nazi foreign office concede the same rights to an American craft, blundering into some spirited German-British encounter?

Merchant Marine

WE HAVE heard and read so much about naval expansion and a two-ocean Navy that we have not had occasion to notice the rapid construction and expansion of our merchant marine.

The *Merchant Marine Act of 1936* launched the building program, but the *National Defense Act* accelerated the program along the road to completion.

Under the terms of the *Act*, America's new merchant marine will have an additional million tons of shipping, distributed among 174 ships. To date, 47 of these ships have been completed and are in service, while the remainder are on the ways and from 25 to 90 per cent completed.

All of these ships are destined for the passenger and cargo trade; but all of them without exception will be available for use as auxiliaries to the United States Navy.

Every ship has been planned in accordance with naval specifications so as to be convertible with a minimum of expense and in the shortest possible time into Navy auxiliaries.

However, while building up our own merchant marine, this country is buying up private-owned ships for use as troop ships and permitting Great Britain to do the same.

Britain has built up her merchant marine by replacing losses in her shipping and by buying or leasing privately-owned ships of British companies or of neutral countries.

Thus, the United States is following the example of Britain in building up a magnificent new cargo and merchant service, and at the same time co-ordinating all elements of maritime strength to form a completely unified seagoing defensive and offensive force.

* * *

Following the first World War, in which America had built up a merchant marine, we scrapped, destroyed and sold our ships; so that we became completely dependent upon the ships of other nations for carrying our normal trade.

The British merchant marine benefited most from this foolish policy which served to cripple American trade and commerce.

This country now has the opportunity, through a rebuilt merchant marine, to regain the markets we previously surrendered.

Since the continental Americas are isolated by war and blockade, we now have the chance to build up a sound commerce. Why don't we?

Multiple Enemies

WE AMERICANS are victims of the most blundering diplomacy in the history of the world.

We have made sure that we have as many enemies as possible before we send our children to war.

We, the people, have voted; we have chosen a leader who has made his course clear. We must stand behind him.

The above points were made by Will Durant, author and lecturer, who adds:

"Whatever the future, I will take my place, with a heavy heart, and try to see it through."

Mr. Durant addressed general sessions of the Wisconsin Education Association in Milwaukee.

"The greatest tragedy," he said, "is not that right is pitted against wrong, but that right fights against right."

Mr. Durant told Wisconsin's teachers that he feared that in another six months it will be impossible — if not illegal — to speak in America of world problems with true impartiality!

Impersonating, successively, a Japanese, a Russian, a German, an Englishman, and an American, Mr. Durant presented the case for each. His presentation, as reported by the *Milwaukee Journal*, follows:

"I am a Japanese," he began. "Without realizing it, you Americans have been conniving to create a communistic China, which will be the greatest enemy of your own United States. China's most powerful support comes from Chinese and Russian Communists. We Japanese want only coal and iron of northern China and the markets of the Chinese world. We need these to keep alive our industrial system which you Americans forced upon us when you ordered an end to our peaceful agricultural isolation in 1853. We would like to be on your side. Why can't we get together?"

* * *

Taking the part of a Russian Communist, Durant said:

"You Americans must realize that your democracy is not all that it could be. Why can't you sympathize with our search for an even better form of government? We can't afford freedom, yet. We must have a dictator because of danger of attack, just as you Americans will when you go to war. England and Germany are maneuvering you Americans into war with Japan; Germany to divert your attention, England to draw you in. You need us Russians. Let's be friends."

* * *

Speaking as a German:

"We Germans didn't choose between fascism and democracy. We had to choose in 1932 between Fascism and Communism. Our voters then were one-third Communists. We must have national freedom first, then individual freedom. England is trying to perpetuate an injustice. She is seeking the blood of America to preserve her conquests. You think we are uncivilized. What country in the last 150 years produced the greatest philosophers, scientists, physicians, composers and scholars? Wasn't it Germany? Democracy is a luxury. When you are surrounded by enemies you, too, will abandon democracy to unify yourselves."

* * *

The English viewpoint:

"It's true we English began in conquest, but we ended in freedom, bringing it to all parts of the world. We don't dare give India its freedom now because the 240-million Hindus would at once destroy the 70-million Moslems — and the Moslems are our only hope in the Mediter-

(Continued on Page 12)

Comment

(Continued from Page 11)

ranean war zone. We are fighting for our lives. If we lose, we will fall to a government of gangsters where a man with a gun decides what the mind shall think, the voice say and the faith believe. You Americans say we are fighting for what you hold dear. Yet you refuse to join us."

* * *

Then Durant spoke for himself as an American:

"Shall we let England be destroyed? Shall we let fascism win all over the world, even in the fascist hearts in the United States? If we go to the aid of England we shall lose our democracy. I wonder if we will be able to get it back at the end of four years?"

When America Gives

ONLY the "insiders" know, or realize, the extent to which unannounced Government policies have already committed the United States to the cause of Great Britain's war effort, says a Washington correspondent.

Even the Generals in the War Department did not know that the administration had entered into an "arrangement" with Britain whereby British and American aircraft manufacturers will produce exactly the same types of airplanes.

It had been announced officially, but in such a way as to disguise the real meaning of the agreement and the extent of the co-operation and co-ordination.

Sometime ago, President Roosevelt, as readers will recall, announced the appointment of a "Committee on the Standardization of Airplanes," composed of Messrs. Morgenthau, Knudsen, Stimson and Knox, with the comment that this committee would "standardize our production of planes with that of Britain."

The announcement attracted almost no attention.

* * *

But now it is revealed that the committee has proceeded with this "standardization" to the point where the British will produce virtual replicas of America's new flying boats, the highly respected Curtiss P 40 and certain Martin and Douglas bombers.

It is also expected that the British will reproduce Navy and Army planes being built and developed by aeronautical firms, in the "combine" dominated by one of America's biggest banking houses.

The plans to establish such an aviation "combine" were reportedly formulated three years ago, when this banking house appointed an aviation co-ordinator.

The plans reportedly went into operation when, through members of the family in various Government departments, the banking house arranged the sale of planes to Poland, Sweden, France and Britain.

The agreement, of course, was supposed to safeguard, even from Britain, the famous bombsight and a few other military secrets.

However, it now appears that — in view of other deals supplementing the arrangement — America and Britain may have agreed to swap even military "secrets."

The standardization agreement was a great surprise. For even the axis partners, in their forceful and effective diplomatic, economic and military co-operation, have not standardized their airplanes, nor have they swapped each other's military secrets.

Older and wiser nations do not trust each other that far. Too often, the allies of today become the enemies of tomorrow. Witness our open exchange of information with France and Russia, both of whom may at any time be on the "other side."

Who shall guarantee that the British whom we now trust so completely with our all will not, if future emergencies should suit them, make other deals and other alliances through which our "secrets," conceivably would be used against us?

It has happened, you know.

Priests in Germany

TWENTY-THREE priests of German nationality are still held prisoners in Nazi concentration camps; five hundred Polish priests were taken to the concentration camp in Sachsenhausen and subjected to the none-too-gentle treatment of prisoners of war.

"The only crime of these priests is that they profess and preach the Christian Faith," says the *Ave Maria* (November 9).

"French priests are also held as prisoners of war. We have not learned in the recent past what is the condition of religious Brothers and Nuns; but our guess is, it is not a bed of roses.

"Naziism aims not merely at the glorification of a people, but at glorification without God, without religion, Nationhood, in the scheme, is to be planted on a platform of intellectual naturalism in which there is no space for God or for man's recognition of Him.

"Men who serve the spirit—priests and ministers — are not wanted in the Nazi scheme. They are in the way. They obstruct the religion of racial divinity of which Hitler is pontiff. And so they are sent to concentration camps, away from their people."

Progress

IN THE STORY of his business career, under the title of *"Adventures of a White Collar Worker,"* Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of General Motors, wonders, as the latest models roll off the production lines, "how in the world any further improvement could be hoped for, or even dreamed of."

But, interposes the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch,* optimistically, "the last word in *automobilia* has not been pronounced, and, from all visible tokens, never will be . . . Paraphrasing Brother Tennyson, 'In the Fall a livelier iris comes upon the polished hood and a nimbler red corpuscle courses through the engine's blood' . . .

"Meantime, the lights in the laboratories burn brightly on. The treadmill of research knows no end, no pause. Engineering seeks further frontiers of operative efficiency. Artists are painting pictures of tomorrow's cars in handsomer design and richer decoration.

"Sisyphus had a pretty steady job rolling up the stone that tumbled back down the hill just before he reached the top. But he had nothing on the unknown toilers in the vast studios where are drawn the blueprints which the genius of massed production resolves into the miraculous motor car."

New Japanese Move

THE RECENT withdrawal of Japanese troops from the Kwangsi province of China may be of far greater significance than its strictly military aspects suggest.

It well may be another important move in the co-operative Japanese-Russian-German checker game in the Far East, the object of which is destruction of the British Empire.

Military observers say Japan's position in Kwangsi was untenable because of renewed activity of Chinese troops, and because the Japs themselves had weakened their Kwangsi defense by dispatching part of the force to Indo-China.

Diplomatists, however, see the move as a manifestation of Japanese-Russian collaboration which is being strongly urged and "master-minded" by Germany. The Nazis are anxious to draw Soviet Russia and Japan together so that the latter two powers will co-operate by threatening the British in the Far East while Germany and Italy concentrate on the European and African theater.

Viewed in that light the Kwangsi retreat is more than a mere military maneuver. The province of Kwangsi long has been headquarters of Chinese Communist troops, and Soviet influence has been particularly strong. Because of its geographical situation the province would make an ideal buffer State separating Soviet-controlled China from Japanese-controlled China.

In such an arrangement, it is believed, the State would be governed by Chinese Communists serving as Soviet puppets. Supporting the government would be Soviet and Chinese Communist troops.

This plan was reportedly engineered by Hugo Stamer, German emissary to Japan, who has been engaged in patching Soviet and Japanese diplomatic differences. So successful has he been, observers say, that Japan was willing to surrender Kwangsi to convince Russia of her good faith in joining with the Rome-Berlin-Moscow axis.

* * *

The scheme also calls for a double-cross of Chiang Kai Shek by Josef Stalin, the purpose being assurance of the Soviet *status quo* in North China. It is expected that Chiang soon will be denied the supplies Russia has been shipping overland into China.

Britain and America, however, will still be aiding China and at the same time will presumably be wooing Stalin — a star in the Axis lineup.

Any day now, announcement may be made of a full diplomatic agreement between Stalin and Japan's Prince Konoye.

When that occurs Hitler is expected to call a joint meeting of German, Italian, Russian and Japanese statesmen to formulate a plan for establishing a "new order" in the Axis-dominated areas.

Meanwhile Russia and Japan can be expected to continue their Far Eastern aggressions in order to harass the United States, force us to concentrate on guarding the Pacific and hence divert our attention from aiding Great Britain.

Informed sources declare that the upshot of Hitler's proposed 4-power Axis parley will be submission of a new peace plan to Great Britain — a plan providing for establishment of the "new order" under totalitarian auspices.

Comment

Friction in the Axis

Is THE Rome-Berlin-Moscow axis really a united front?

On the surface, of course, it is.

On the other hand, reports and actions evidence dissension and mistrust among the axis partners.

Was Mussolini double-crossed by Hitler when he attacked Greece and met a wholly unexpected stiff resistance?

Was Stalin playing Mussolini and Hitler against each other, in massing 30 divisions of mechanized troops opposite the Roumanian frontier and thus inducing Hitler to withhold aid for Mussolini's Grecian campaign?

Mussolini's so far disastrous invasion of Greece, with Hitler appearing to look placidly on, may rebound to the eventual benefit of Germany.

The Greeks, by stopping the Fascist *blitzkrieg* before it had gathered destructive momentum, have given England Britain time to occupy strategic islands in the Aegean and Adriatic Seas, establish air bases, and land enforcements on the Greek mainland.

With such a set-up the British are now in a position to launch heavy aerial offensives against Italian cities and towns.

While thus concentrating on Italy, the British naturally would be forced to slacken their assaults upon Germany itself.

Perhaps Hitler's arch diplomat, Franz von Papen, had assured Italy that Greece was completely under German influence and that Turkey would not enter the contest. Certainly German statesmen must have been in a position to know the facts in which Italy, apparently, was deceived.

Italians are justly suspicious of the Moscow-Berlin axis, which at times seems to turn the outer Rome-Berlin-Tokyo-Moscow axis.

If he can help it, Mussolini will not allow Hitler to sit by passively and watch the rout of his Italian legions by the underrated Greeks. Instead, he will call on Hitler to send Nazi reinforcements through Jugoslavia.

But Hitler, obviously uncertain of Stalin, will not accommodate Mussolini until he knows Soviet Russia's intentions. The latter can be counted upon to determine the action of Turkey.

As this is written Hitler probably has learned Stalin's intentions, although they have not been made public. What Molotov told Hitler unquestionably will decide the future course of the war in the Balkans and conceivably may determine the fate of Europe, Asia and Africa.

If Molotov's message from Stalin was one of co-operation it merely adds mystery to a recent Exchange Telegraph report from Zurich which indicated that Stalin was merely marking time, awaiting a "Communist revolution" in Germany.

The dispatch quoted an article allegedly written by Stalin and said to have been published in *Taryby Lietuva*, Soviet organ in Lithuania.

"The coming revolution in Germany," Stalin was quoted, "will have a better background than the Communistic revolution which began during the World War, for it will have Russia behind it."

All of which lends further credence to the widely accepted conviction that Stalin's objective is to prolong the war to the point where a prostrate Europe will succumb as an easy victim of Soviet domination.

—Cartoonist Fitzpatrick in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The Spectre of Famine

THE SPECTRE of famine looms over Western Europe—the results of the ruthless destructiveness of an insane war.

But this hunger which threatens tens of millions of the common people of Europe (it won't touch the ruling classes in any country) is but an especially acute form of the chronic famine to which the masses are subjected at all times and in all countries under capitalism.

Here in the United States there is talk of a huge food "surplus" which is spelling ruin for the poor farmer. There is crafty maneuvering to make sure that the South American "surplus" does not find a buyer before the North American "surplus."

But these are not surpluses at all—they do not consist of stores of food beyond the *requirements* of the masses, but only beyond their *purchasing power*.

Meanwhile, tens of millions of children on both American continents are undernourished while their parents suffer under a combination of speed-up and inadequate food.

Buy Christian Cards

SHOPPERS are now engaged in purchasing their Christmas cards.

In so far as Christmas is identified with the birth of Christ, only thoughtless Christians will patronize manufacturers of those cards and printed greetings which glorify a reindeer, a *wassail* party, a pack of hounds, a skating queen or a yule log.

Buy Christian cards — and ask your pastor, your club leader, your storekeeper, to encourage this practice.

The Red Shield

SWINGING over the doorway of a narrow-fronted, high-gabled old house in the shadowed Judengasse of Frankfurt, 200 years ago, was the trading sign of a red shield.

The house was that of a Jewish money-changer, one of whose sons, Meyer Amschel, was destined to launch a financial empire such as Europe—and the world—had never seen.

A few weeks ago, the time-honored nameplate, successor of the old Red Shield of two centuries ago, was taken down.

An inconspicuous note in Hitler's *Volkischer Beobachter* recorded the end of the House of Rothschild in Germany.

The *Bronx Home News*, which reports this event, goes on to recount the following story of "The Red Shield":

"Young Meyer laid the foundations of his fortunes when he brought joy to the heart of Frankfurt's coin-collecting Landgrave by selling him some old specimens at bargain prices.

"He went steadily ahead until his first foreign loan of 10-million thalers to Denmark, in 1801, marked him out as a man of substance.

"When the Landgrave was compelled to flee the country before the invading French armies, he entrusted his valuables to Meyer, who quietly buried them in his back garden. As opportunity arose Meyer realized the prince's assets so shrewdly that the Landgrave eventually received back his fortune, together with 5 per cent interest.

"The period of the Napoleonic wars established the Rothschilds as an international force. Meyer had five sons.

"Furnished with $100,000 capital Nathan first settled in Manchester, bought textiles for the continental branches, which were supplying the armies. In a short while he had increased his capital to $300,000.

"Five years later he moved to London, where his spectacular methods on the foreign exchange caused the soberer Quaker bankers to regard him as unsound.

"By making himself indispensable to the British government Nathan obtained the handling of foreign loans to the value of $100-million which were raised to keep Britain's allies in the field against Napoleon.

"In the troubled period of peace which followed Waterloo — news of which 30 hours in advance of Wellington's dispatch, enabled Nathan to make a stock market killing—the Rothschild branches handled $250-million in loans for the impoverished European Powers between 1815-1830.

"It was now that the House of Rothschild had risen to the peak of its influence, so that it became known as the sixth great power in Europe, intimately associated with the statesmen and statecraft of the period.

"With the rise of improved means of communication available to all, and the formation of giant joint stock banks, the power of the Rothschilds declined. Nevertheless, by 1904 they had undertaken or participated in loans to the estimated value of $6½-billion.

"Ennobled for their power, honored for their charities, with their name synonymous with extreme wealth, the turn of the present century saw the Rothschilds playing a relatively diminished role in finance, cultivating the part of country gentry, connoisseurs.

"In Germany the original Frankfurt House continued to transact business under the name of Rothschild, even after Hitler's seizure of power in 1933, though the far-sighted German family liquidated its banking interest a year before."

Comment

General Hugh Johnson Eats Some Crow

THESE ARE grievous times for General Hugh Johnson, the former "Blue Eagle" regimenter.

The military columnist made his first blunder of the recent election campaign when he promised to "eat the Gallup Poll" if President Roosevelt were re-elected.

Then, in a last emotional week before November 5th, he made a few radio speeches in support of Wendell Willkie, in which he undiplomatically talked about Jews.

During a talk at Trenton, New Jersey, for example, the General stated that "of our non-Christian groups, *95 per cent are voting for Roosevelt, because he will lead us into war against the anti-Jew and anti-Christ Hitler.*"

Now, anyone with a wide acquaintanceship among Jewish people knows that the General's statement was a conservative estimate. It would be more correct to say that 99.44 per cent, of New York's Jews at any rate, are in favor of the United States going to war against Germany.

No sooner had "old Ironpants" made his statement, however, than a deluge of protests began pouring into the offices of the *New York World Telegram*, chief newspaper of the Scripps Howard chain.

Although the *Telegram* hastened to reply that it was not responsible for the opinions of its columnists, the lucrative writing job of the former N.R.A. "cracker-downer" was temporarily in peril; and he ate, as the saying is, some crow.

Somewhat chastened, the General must be considerably wiser now, and know — with others — that you can criticize the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, the Anglo-Saxons, the Christians and the Catholics, as much as you please, but if you so much as mention "the Jews" you are an anti-Semite" and, therefore, a traitor!

* * *

"I am astounded that part of a radio speech by me was regarded as anti-Semitic," the General wrote.

"I used Jewish dialect in a radio speech about a recent War Department survey of the coffin industry defended by Major Ginsberg. That," wrote the General, "was poor comedy, *but it isn't anti-Semitism!*

"I have never in my life heard a Jew attacked because he was a Jew without seeing red and going to town — but I am equally indignant at any claim that any man is *absolved from criticism for his purely secular acts because of his religion!*"

* * *

And that, incidentally, is what we used to tell 'em down at the office.

* * *

Among the protests which poured in upon Gen. Johnson was a letter from his good friend, Bernard M. Baruch, who wrote:

"Many things have been told me as to what you have written and said about the Jews and the various interpretations that can be put upon them. The point resented above all is any statement or implication that the Jews desire war. Because they would suffer all the horrors of war that others suffer, and more besides, they are the last to want war.

"In the now nearly 23 years that I have known you I have never seen any evidence of anti-Semitism. *If you had any such feelings it would have ended our relations.*

"You led the battle against Huey Long.

"Your 'Pied Piper' speech was a ruinous blast against Father Coughlin.

"I recall your statements against General Moseley, et al.

"I recall the scathing protest you made against Hitler while you were in the N.R.A. and the diplomatic protest it brought.

"Some two years ago, when I made a statement on the necessity of America rearming, it brought down upon me the wrath of Hitler, et al., who attacked me as a warmonger. I recall your answers.

"You were selected by the *American Hebrew* to present the Jewish award for tolerance to the President.

"Because of these and other things *I write not as a Jew but as an American,* which is what we all should be first, last and always."

(And the italics are ours.)

* * *

The General's explanation concludes:

"My error — if error it was — is that I never stop to think whether an American is a Jew or a Gentile. In N.R.A. among my principal assistants *I had more Jews than Gentiles.* When somebody criticized N.R.A. as a Sanhedrin it occurred to me for the first time that I had never given the distinction a thought. I selected the people whom I knew, trusted and who seemed to me most competent.

"From my college fraternity days, as the record will prove, I have fought against any shadow of discrimination. Wide publicity was given to my careful professional study of the Trial of Jesus, which showed in strict jurisprudence that the crucifixion resulted from a small racketeering *clique* and a perversion of both Jewish and Roman law and not from the Jewish people, who, while He lived, adored and followed Him in such hordes *that the attempt to kill Him for His opinions was deferred three years for fear of them.*

"Jews are Americans with all the privileges and also complete exposure to criticism, razzing and raillery that their fellow citizenship implies."

It's Still 'Roosevelt'

A TEXAS correspondent informs us that when Elliott Roosevelt gave up his $60,000-a-year job as president of the Texas State Network, to serve his country in the capacity of Captain in the Army Air Corps at a measly $65 a week, he relinquished his duties as a radio executive to none other than his wife.

Thus, the Captain might console himself that his much-publicized gesture of self-sacrificing patriotism need not deprive him of spending money.

Mrs. Elliott Roosevelt is reported to have surprised fellow workers with her business abilities and has already increased the network's commercial time.

'What a Question!'

FREEDOM of the press rules in the White House, says the *Tribune* of Dubuque. There is no bar to the type of question that may be asked in the President's press conference, despite the fact that the majority of the newspapers are anti-administration, says the *Tribune* writer who recounts the following example:

"Here is a question that was asked — that could not be asked today in any other country — and that was answered (after a certain fashion, to be sure) by the President. We quote:

"Question: 'Mr. Roosevelt, in coming political speeches, do you intend to answer charges made by your political opposition that you are seeking to become a dictator, and that if you are elected, there will be nothing to prevent you from doing so?'

"Most questions are shorter and simpler than this one, which had to be written out in advance.

"The President replied, 'That is interesting. It has everything except the kitchen stove in it. Who wrote it?'

"Questioner: 'I did.'

"The President: 'Good boy. My congratulations to you.'

"Questioner: 'Is there an answer?'

"The President: 'My congratulations to you. It is beautifully worded!'

"And that, except for the laughter," says the *Tribune*, "ended the cross-examination."

Ireland and the War

PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL is trying his level best to induce Ireland (Eire) to modify her neutrality to the end that the ports in the south of Ireland may be used as naval bases for Britain.

In a recent speech Mr. Churchill indicated that there was more danger to England from attacks on British shipping than from attacks on London directly.

In pleading with President Eamon de Valera for Irish aid, Mr. Churchill fails to manifest the diplomacy for which the British are noted.

For more than a decade the British government has opposed the union of the North and South of Ireland.

It is the same Britain that now seeks aid and succor from the Irish whom Britain notoriously persecuted over the centuries.

Mr. de Valera will not heed Mr. Churchill's pleadings.

According to Mr. Hastings, B. Lees-Smith, a Laborite member of the Churchill parliament, Britain needs Berehaven and Lough Swilly.

And hints were thrown out that if Ireland did not concede these naval bases, Britain will take them by force.

Taking them by force may be the last card Britain will play in this instance.

It is expected that Lord Lothian will intercede with the Roosevelt Administration for the latter to bring its moral force upon Ireland—moral force being translated by trade benefits, commercial treaties, etc.

It is our solid judgment that Ireland will not receive any bribe from any quarter to participate in the saving of the British Empire.

Senator Lee's Money Bill

THE WASHINGTON correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune* (Willard Edwards, November 3) disclosed a startling story associated with the name of Senator Josh Lee.

He said that the re-election of President Roosevelt, in the opinion of informed members of Congress, would result in an attempt to resuscitate the money-drafting plan sponsored by the schoolteacher solon.

The story runs as follows:

"New Dealers have sought to soft-pedal this probability. The Lee bill has been denounced by financial experts as a breeder of economic chaos and confusion if it should become law. But the measure is generally recognized as one of the grants of superpower which Mr. Roosevelt will seek if he is returned to office for a third term.

"The bill has been lying on the Senate calendar since it was reported favorably, 12 to 2, by the Senate Military Affairs Committee in May, 1939.

"Economists have dismissed the bill as one of the most mischievous crackpot proposals ever put before Congress. Yet it gained the Senate committee's approval and it is in a position to be brought before both houses if Mr. Roosevelt gets another "mandate," even by a bare majority.

"The bill provides that whenever Congress declares war or declares 'that the imminence of war has created an emergency which in the judgment of the President is sufficiently serious to necessitate an increase in the military establishment by the drafting of manpower,' the President shall cause to be taken a census of the net wealth of every person in the United States.

" " "

"As a result of passage of the *Conscription Bill*, it was noted that this phraseology would permit the Lee measure to go into force immediately upon its enactment.

"The net wealth of every person in excess of $1,000 would be subject under the bill to the borrowing power of the Government in graduated portions, ranging from 5 per cent of wealth in excess of $1,000 and not more than $10,000, to 75 per cent of wealth in excess of $100-million.

"Representative amounts available to the Government would be $450 on $10,000, $9,450 on $100,000, $81,950 on $500,000, $206,950 on $1-million, $4,331,950 on $10-million, $64,456,950 on $100-million, and $75-million on fortunes in excess of $100-million.

"The Secretary of the Treasury would determine the amount of money needed from time to time and the President would pro rate among individuals the sums they were required to 'invest.' In exchange they would receive Government bonds, payable at the option of the Government, but not due until 50 years, bearing interest of 1 per cent and not tax exempt either as to principal or interest.

"Senator Lee has estimated that the bill would make available the astronomical amount of $350-billion for war purposes, to be spent by the President without any limitation whatever.

"A committee minority report on the bill signed by Senators Styles Bridges (R., N. H.), Warren R. Austin (R., Vt.), and Chan Gurney (R., S. D.), declared:

" 'Without doubt, adoption of this proposed legislation would cause in the event of war a severe and drastic economic disturbance. As a breeder of economic chaos and confusion in the critical period at the beginning of American entry into a general war, this measure would thus seriously impede and hamper the prosecution of such a conflict to a successful conclusion, probably prolonging it and adding to the loss of life.'

" " "

"This opinion was written when it was believed that the nation's manpower would not be drafted unless war was imminent. Passage of the bill now, with the draft act already in the law, would enable the President immediately to wrest as many billions as he wanted from the people. He would not have to wait for an 'emergency' caused by the threat of war.

"Both the War and Navy departments reported that the bill would be detrimental to the national defense and the Treasury department said it would not work. But in the hands of the President it would be a paralyzing weapon with which to strike at the 'unholy alliance' which he says is working against him."

So It's Democracy

"WELL, Joe," said Cyril Spindlefoot, a toothpick salesman, "what do you think of the election?"

Joe Click is a business man. He manufactures a complete line of medium priced mouse traps, designed to catch customers as well as mice.

"Oh, it depends on how you look at it, Cyril," the latter replied. "I was a Willkie man, but I'm 100 per cent for unity now. What gets me is how we're going to achieve it, though."

Joe went on to explain that it's pretty difficult to say "presto" and immediately forget all the charges and counter-charges dished out by both sides in the long campaign.

"Take Willkie and Vandenberg and John Lewis and Hugh Johnson and Al Smith," Joe continued. "I'm sure they sincerely believed that the administration's foreign policy was leading us to war and that its domestic policies were retarding prosperity and heading us for bankruptcy. Those millions of people who voted for Willkie must have felt the same way, too.

"They're not gonna change overnight, you know. And Roosevelt says his policies will be the same as they have been. So I can't figure out how those people will support the President any more than they did before."

" " "

Cyril allowed as how this is a democracy of sorts and the minority must accept the decisions of the majority.

"I don't think the situation is any different than it ever was," he argued. "We've been having elections for about 150 years and survived every one of them. There's always been a hot campaign fight, but after it's all over the dire prophecies of the losers are forgotten and the country gets along just as though nothing had ever happened."

"Yeah, I see what you mean, Cyril," said Joe, "and I'm all for it. The majority rules. I'm not questioning that. It's the American form of government and has proved to be pretty good up to date. But the majority is not necessarily right and the minority wrong, you know. I'm perfectly willing to go along with the administration. I'm as patriotic as the next fellow, but I can't help wondering about that war. We're half way in now and there's no sign of a let-up. Then there's the national debt. What about that, if we keep going into the hole every year? Eventually the bottom will drop out of everything. And when the defense program is finished there'll be even more unemployment than there is now—unless the administration can coax new capital into industry."

" " "

Cyril Spindlefoot, the toothpick salesman, had listened attentively.

"I'm afraid you're a little too pessimistic, Joe. Twenty-seven million people can't be wrong. Just have faith in our President and he'll pull us through."

"Well, I hope you're right," said Joe, "but unless the President changes his mind about a few things, I'm afraid that I'm right—and this is one time I'd rather be wrong than right."

Time for a Check-up

MR. SY FOSTER of Carson City, Nevada, writes an arresting letter to the "America by Statesmanship Crusade," in which he says:

"I am just now investigating a report which alleges that out of 5,000 cards sent to the addresses of as many registered voters in the writer's county, 700 of them came back with the notation that *no such voter had ever lived at the address given*, and another 500 came back marked 'Moved!' "

The letter continued:

"The possibility of a crew of men starting at one county and there registering under a certain name, then moving on to the next county and registering under another name, is one to conjure with and one that may account for the unexplainable vote tallies of recent elections. The possibility that such acts could take place in every county of the United States under the guidance of a well organized unscrupulous minority is one that should receive the attention of every vigilant American.

"I have discussed the possibility of such a fraud, and the possible remedy, with several prominent leaders here. They are agreed that the only possible remedy is a careful check of all registrants. To send cards to all of them involves an expenditure of several thousand dollars even for a small district. This leaves the only possible alternative of making a personal check in each precinct by the precinct leaders. This is also a tremendous job, but one that could be consummated if a concerted attempt was made to do so, by, say, the Republican Party or any other agency with a national organization extending into all precincts.

"The writer's forebearers came to America in 1636. They played an important role in early American history. Much of the battle of Bunker Hill was fought out on Foster's Field. He can but hang his head in shame in the realization that he is now a stranger, an OUTCAST as it were, *in his own land. He has been disfranchised by the very evil you hope to remedy.*"

Letters

(SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally, the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.)

Western Hemisphere

To The Editor:

In the October 21st issue of Social Justice Magazine, the Western Hemisphere was outlined as including, Iceland, Ireland, Scotland, part of England, France, Spain, etc.

This statement has caused considerable dispute among my friends, they contending that on page 15 of *Frye's Grammar School Geography*, published by Ginn & Co., the Western Hemisphere is pictured as covering only North and South America and a small part of Russia.

Being a reader of Social Justice, I contend your statement is correct.

Will you please settle this dispute as soon as possible by writing to the undersigned.

Lynn, Mass. — M.E.C.

Editor's Note: There is no such thing, of course, as a "Western Hemisphere," except as we arbitrarily divide the globe into two divisions. For convenience of geographical study it is customary to include the American Continents in one and Europe, Asia, Africa and Australia in the Eastern half. The Rand McNally atlases designate this as the "popular" hemisphere. Our draft law (sec. 2 E) reads that the land forces of the United States "*shall not be employed beyond the limits of the western hemisphere.*" This requires some longitudinal parallel beyond which we may not legally go. If this is not "zero," on the Greenwich parallel, where is it — and why? Adult readers will remember the three-mile limit and twelve-mile limits of prohibition days. Social Justice does not undertake to *settle* the question; it merely *asks* it: Where does the Western Hemisphere start? Where must a battleship or a troop transport, operating under our new law, stop? Our popular geographies and encyclopedias and atlases are not enough; this is a *law*.

Later Than We Think

To The Editor:

On page 8 of October 28 edition is a statement saying that the world-wide question concerning the Jews probably will never be settled, and a few more statements to this effect.

There is a message in many Catholic prayerbooks handed down to us through the ages which we Christians almost deny ourselves and the Jews of. It reads as follows:

(Amos IX, 13-14.)

"Thus saith the Lord, Behold the days come, when the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed, and the mountains shall drop sweetness, and every hill shall be tilled. And I will bring back the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall build the abandoned cities, and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine of them, and shall make gardens, and eat the fruits of them, and I will plant them upon their own land; and I will no more pluck them out of their land which I gave them; saith the Lord thy God."

We may be nearing the time when this message will be fulfilled.

— C.O'L.

Mamaroneck, N. Y.

Likes Quotes From Record

To The Editor:

Until recently I have enjoyed Social Justice immensely. Lately, there has been entirely too much *Comment* in it to suit me.

I should like about three pages less of *Comment*, a page or two of news, and a page of excerpts from the *Congressional Record*.

I believe we should have news because I like to form my own opinion and I am sure that others also will like to do this.

In my opinion a page from the *Congressional Record* should be appropriate because most of us do not have either the time or the patience to sit down and read the *Record* for important news and information.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for the light that you have shed on questions of national and international importance.

— Miss M.L.

St. Louis, Mo.

We Did Not Create Liberty, We Only Preserved It

To The Editor:

As An American, I am proud of the land of my birth. As a free American, I am ever thankful that this land found its birth in the mind of God. I don't believe, however, that the freedom of man began with the American *Declaration of Independence*.

Great men like Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln did not create freedom for us, or for the slave. They were God-fearing and honest, as they were following the precedent set by Him in the garden of Eden. There He decreed that the will of man was to be free, supreme within himself — for God or against God.

If God, Creator of all things, disdained such power, who is mere man who would go above God and shackle men's wills to a singleness of purpose, and desire? From Washington, D. C., we now learn that we have reached the limits of our frontiers, that we have attained the peak of national perfection. I refuse to accept this fallacy. You and I know that on the other side of that peak is decline.

I will not debate the question of our physical frontiers. Mere acquisition of territory alone does not make a nation great. Intellectual and cultural frontiers are of vastly greater importance. Any man, particularly the man to whom is entrusted the welfare of the nation, who declares we have reached the point of stagnation is no longer capable of heading such a nation as ours on to greater heights.

Having failed to solve the more serious of our domestic problems, some administration leaders would have us believe that they have done all that man can do, and no one can do better. A lot of New Deal legislation while basically good has failed due to mismanagement. For example, W.P.A., the most dictatorial of bureaucracies, has contributed more than anything else excepting unemployment to the political failure.

The political theme now seems to be the Prussianization of America in the name of national defense. Deliberate hate, hysteria and fear have been created for the purpose of regimenting a frightened people. In Washington and London they have the brass to call this educating the people.

The founder of the *New York Herald Tribune*, Horace Greeley, in 1863, denounced the draft as unconstitutional. He said:

"The idea of military conscription being profoundly repugnant to the American mind, it might have been supposed that unusual steps would have been taken by the friends of that resort (i.e., friends of conscription) to present in utter frankness, and in the light best adapted to dissipate popular hostility. Nothing of the sort was done. It was not only a conscription, but an act passed by conscription."

If we allow this *clique* in Washington to deprive us of our liberties, even for a month, the harm would be done.

A precedent established, that would make the military a dominant factor in our American Government. Are we to deprive our children of that heritage intended to last as long as America itself? They, too, are the children of the Lord's Supper, that magnificent, bounteous banquet of peace, freedom, tolerance, and love of fellow man. We have no right to deny them to partake, and less right to permit others to do so.

Those politicians, and editors who piously proclaim that the American people want conscription, I denounce as misinformers and traitors to American liberty.

— J.A.M.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Race or Religion?

To The Editor:

In the October 28th issue of Social Justice I read an article of the pen of one George E. Sokolsky, viz:

"The Jews are not a race or a nation or a nationality. They're a religion, a faith."

This is a bold statement. Let us see by a simple little test, how true that is.

I will line up in front of you five men, all of them about the same age, and all of them complete strangers to you. Of these five men, one is a Roman Catholic, one a Lutheran, one a Protestant, one Nazarene and one Jew.

Now, I ask you to point out the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Nazarene one by one, but you must not make a mistake. I am sure you will fail.

But, if I ask you to show me the Jew, no doubt you'll be 100% right. Without any special study, you can (with few exceptions) recognize a Jew on the street, when he is a block away. How? Because of his religion and faith? No! Because they are a distinct race!

School children know this. Yet some Jew has the nerve to publicly deny it, thinking that the gullible Christians will swallow all, hook and sinker.

Center Line, Mich. — A.L.S.

Valuable Reading Matter

To The Editor:

Since Mr. Willkie was never interested enough in Father Coughlin to read his instructions or listen to his broadcasts, it is regrettable that he took the time to listen to some vicious lies that were told concerning him.

I hope Mr. Willkie will soon have time to read Father Coughlin's writings and broadcasts.

Philadelphia, Pa. — J.C.

Arrant Discrimination

To The Editor:

The un-democratic N.A.B. has discriminated against a group of radio speakers.

James Ford and Earl Browder have recently addressed the American people by radio. The former lauded the "Communist Party" of the United States. Both severely criticized our American form of government.

These Stalinites are a dangerous group of potential *saboteurs*, thousands of them working in industrial centers. For many years they have practiced Dimitroff's "Trojan Horse" policy; however, these termites have recently been disclosed by the investigations of that great loyal American, Martin Dies, whose democratic activities were called "sordid."

Father Coughlin attacked only the atheistic Communists and was refused time on the air. This is only one of the undesirable activities in the category. Most who do not see eye-to-eye with the controllers are penalized.

I challenge the readers of Social Justice to protest this discrimination against Father Coughlin.

Minneapolis, Minn. — E.E.B.

Letters

Deportation Failed

To The Editor:

If the New Deal high command can recess the battle of Britain for a few moments, I would like to have them explain this:

Last year, after repeated failures, the American Legion asked Congressman Joe Starnes, of Alabama, to sponsor another deportation bill. He knew what he was up against, but went ahead and put this bill *(H.R. 6724)* before the House.

After heroic efforts the American Legion blasted this bill out of committee and into the open for fair and free debate. During this time Mr. Starnes received innumerable threats and literally one ton of abusive letters and telegrams, inspired by Communist organizations.

Now, let us examine this terrible bill. What were its provisions? It provided for the mandatory deportation of the following:

Every alien anarchist.

Every alien revolutionist.

Every alien *saboteur.*

Every alien espionage agent.

Every alien criminal.

Every alien habitual drug addict.

Check off every provision, one by one.

Are there any of these groups that you would be especially anxious to keep in the United States? Evidently, Congress shared your opinion for, after some stubborn opposition, this bill passed the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

This measure *was vetoed by the President on June 14, 1940!*

— W.L.N.

Fairmont, Minn.

Editor's Note: The President explained that existing laws and enforcement agencies are adequate to cope with any danger to our liberties.

Communist Technique

To The Editor:

Can you blame anyone for wanting to avoid the "Jewish" persecution, that keeps up despite denial and explanation, until it drives the victim almost crazy?

The same technique used on Father Coughlin was used on Wendell Willkie. Smear, defamation, lies. It is a Communist technique.

Hitler told the truth when the Roosevelts welcomed the refugees, and he said many of them were the riffraff of Europe and that we were welcome to them.

This Willkie campaign struck me as "framed."

— A.E.H.

Pensacola, Fla.

Spirit of Compromise Hampers Fight on Reds

To The Editor:

The real aggressive force of energy of our time is the Russian revolution, just as the French revolution was the aggressive force in Europe from 1792 to 1815. All else has been hoping for security from the storm, or is in retreat before it — private enterprise, the non-Communist governments of the world, Christian culture have been going through the compromise trend to save as much as possible.

Russia pushed out in the Far East for more than ten years before Japan took vigorous counter action. Fascism in Italy and National Socialism in Germany were basically defense moves against red aggression at home, and Franco's Spain revolted against Soviet absorption of a withering republic.

Other countries with ballot rule experienced a similar penetration of red aggression. Surely, it is common knowledge that our own leaders have joined this red penetration instead of protecting this country against it; so also did British Labor party, French confederation of Labor, Liberals, and internationally-minded business generally, chose to try amalgamation with red aggression rather than resistance.

The French revolution produced the first Napoleon; the Russian revolution has produced two — Stalin of Russia and Roosevelt in our United States. The latter has taken a leading role against any counter-revolution. Our diplomacy has not only been against the countries excluding red aggression but against non-Communist elements in supposedly friendly countries — "Chamberlain government," "French rightists," "Mexican reactionaries," "South American fascists," etc.

Red aggression hopes to fatten on war; private enterprise and Christian culture desperately needs peace.

About all of Europe combined against the first Napoleon for security rather than for domination, and it was the success against Napoleon that gave rise to the domination of the Holy Alliance later.

Similarly, the world is liable to combine against us from the belief that there can be no peace while our "Napoleon No. 2" has command of American resources. And success against him might bring about a world domination that was not originally sought.

Meanwhile our new Napoleon No. 1 waits aloof from the struggle, hoping that war exhaustion of all nations will enable Communism to take all. Nearly all who read, know this, but we are paralyzed by the compromise spirit.

— A.B.G.

Mound, Minn.

Want Radio Voice

To The Editor:

We need now more than ever the leadership of one whose patriotism, courage, honesty and wisdom stands out like a beacon light.

Lovers of liberty, that leader is the Radio Priest, whose voice has been stilled.

We must demand his return to the air; he is our last hope.

— C.H.

Bronx, N. Y.

Americans, Before and After



—Cartoonist Carmack in the Christian Science Monitor

Loyalty To Party

To The Editor:

Of course, when your correspondent, P.J.B. of Chicago wrote in the October 28 issue of Social Justice his comment on H.T.P.'s honest and telling criticism of James Aloysius "Everlast" Farley — he could not have known that a few days later his defense of the "patriotism" of the erstwhile Postmaster General would be discounted by "Honest(?) Jim's" public statement of party loyalty and intention to vote the "straight Democratic ticket" come hell or high water, or other disaster to the United States and our Constitutional Government.

For "Honest (?) Jim" would have you know that he is a more loyal "Democrat" than he is a loyal American. That a party label to "Honest (?) Jim" is a dearer emblem than the Stars and Stripes of our Republic.

Which proves H.T.P. was indisputably right in his appraisal of "Loyal New Deal Jim."

Surely, for eight incredible years, James ("Call Me Jim") Farley gave his best efforts to foisting the alien, unAmerican and un-Christian philosophies and policies of the iniquitous New Dealers upon the supine backs of the American people. He was such a "good friend" to F.D.R. and such a loyal New Dealer that, despite the fact that New Dealism had scuttled the Democratic ship of state, and had jettisoned the principles of Thomas Jefferson and others of its traditional leaders for the Republican Party to salvage, he would do nothing to forestall the inevitable disaster to his country as a consequence of such radicalism.

So, of course, it is no inaccuracy to say that in doing so, "James Everlast Farley" did "sell his fellow citizens down the river" for the power and the glory of the New Deal privateers.

"I have preached party loyalty," quoth "James Everlast" in his public statement issued from the Biltmore headquarters of the Democratic State Committee, "and pleaded for the success of my party. I did that because I sincerely believe in the Democratic Party, in its principles and objectives."

— R.L.B.

Kirkwood, N. Y.

Still Our Country

To The Editor:

I am a Catholic, not much of a Catholic, but a better one than before I started to listen to Father Coughlin several years ago.

I have listened to his discourses, and read Social Justice since the first issue, and it is my opinion that anything that takes place in the United States no matter what it may be, whether we are sold into the war, have a dictator, a king, or whatever, we have no one to blame but ourselves.

—H.L.B.

St. Paul, Minn.

STUDY THE CONSTITUTION!

BE READY FOR ALL 50 CONTEST QUESTIONS ON DECEMBER 16

QUESTIONS FOR THIS WEEK

QUESTION No. 15

Who Was the Founder of the First "United States Bank"?

1. Salmon P. Chase.
2. Alexander Hamilton.
3. President Andrew Jackson.
4. John Jay.
5. Benjamin Franklin.
6. Patrick Henry.

QUESTION No. 16

What State of the Union Was Formerly an Independent Republic for Nine Years?

1. Louisiana.
2. Minnesota.
3. Maine.
4. North Carolina.
5. Nevada.
6. Texas.
7. California.
8. Illinois.

Fill in This Coupon and Mail With 10 Cents in Coin

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question.

Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 15 For Question No. 15 I Select Answer No. ☐ **No. 16** For Question No. 16 I Select Answer No. ☐

*Name*_____

*Address*_____

*Town or City*_____ *State*_____

EXTRA COUPON FOR SELF OR FRIEND

Fill in This Coupon and Mail With 10 Cents in Coin

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question.

Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 15 For Question No. 15 I Select Answer No. ☐ **No. 16** For Question No. 16 I Select Answer No. ☐

*Name*_____

*Address*_____

*Town or City*_____ *State*_____

Rules of the Contest

1. The *"AMERICA FIRST" Contest* is open to all readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine, except employes or members of their families.

2. The contest shall consist of 50 questions on the history of the United States and the *Constitution* of the United States and shall run for 11 consecutive weeks beginning the week of October 7. Two questions each week for 10 weeks and all 50 questions on the 11th week.

3. A Grand Prize of $1,500.00 will be awarded the contestant returning the best or most appropriate answers to the 50 questions and otherwise complying with the rules. Contestants submitting the next most nearly correct answers and otherwise complying with the rules shall be eligible for the additional prizes in the order of their correctness.

4. In order to qualify as a prize-winner, the contestant is required to send in 10 cents in coin (not stamps) with each pair of answers, or a total of $2.50 with the 50 answers. For these remittances the contestant will be sent without further cost a handsomely illuminated copy of the *Constitution* suitable for wall decoration.

5. We cannot take into account solutions without signed names and addresses. Neither can claims to their ownership be recognized. We cannot be responsible for coupons arriving unduly late or lost in the mails. By entering the contest the contestant agrees to accept as final the decisions of the judges as to procedure and final outcome.

6. In event of ties, additional questions will be submitted. In event of final ties, after two such submissions, duplicate prizes will be awarded.

7. Do not decorate coupons. Neatness will not count.

8. Any inquiry, the reply to which could not affect outcome of the contest, will be acknowledged.

9. A contestant may send in any number of sets of duly qualified answers and each set will be judged as a unit, but no individual may win more than one prize. If submitting more than one set of answers, the contestant is required to keep them distinct by designating them "Set 1," "Set 2," "Set 3," etc. Each submitted set shall entitle the contestant to the illuminated copy of the *Constitution* referred to in Rule 4.

ADDRESS ALL CONTEST MAIL TO:

'CONTEST MANAGER'—SOCIAL JUSTICE

ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN

Only two more weeks before the closing date of our great "AMERICA FIRST" Contest will be announced. Only two more weeks!

And, then, only a few additional weeks before YOU CAN WIN the Grand Prize of $1,500.00 as easily as any other person entered in this competition.

DON'T ENTER THE CONTEST NOW!

Under the rules, all 50 questions, based upon the history of the United States, and the *Constitution*, will appear in our issue of DECEMBER 16. You will then have ample time to enter and WIN.

But what you MUST do to win is STUDY AND KNOW the *Constitution* of our country.

So, go to work at that important task right now.

We are doing something in this contest we have never done before. We are going to send you a beautifully illuminated copy of the *Constitution*, suitable for wall decoration. EVEN BEFORE YOU START ANSWERING THE CONTEST QUESTIONS.

We will send you this beautiful copy of the *Constitution* right today — upon your saying you intend to enter the Contest when all 50 questions appear.

We shall send you at the same time all past history questions which have appeared since the Contest started. You can also be studying on these.

All you have to do to get this and START TO WORK AT STUDYING is to clip and mail the Coupon at the bottom of this page. Read that Coupon right now. See what it says.

Then mail it. Within a few days your copy of the *Constitution* will be at your door — and you can begin to learn all about it.

Of course, perhaps you have a copy of the *Constitution* in your home. There's a copy in almost every school history. If so, you will not need our wall copy right now. As a contestant, you will receive one anyway.

But, if you have not a copy of the *Constitution* in your home, use the Coupon below at once. All we ask you to do in return is to agree to become a contestant when all 50 questions appear on December 16.

Fair enough, isn't it?

This Could be Your Turn to Win

GRAND PRIZE	**$1,500.00**
Second Prize	**800.00**
Third Prize	**500.00**
Fourth Prize	**300.00**
Fifth Prize	**200.00**
Sixth Prize	**100.00**
Seventh Prize, four cash awards of $25 each	**100.00**
Fifty prizes of $10.00 each	**500.00**
Two Hundred prizes of $5.00 each	**1,000.00**
TOTAL	**$5,000.00**

TO THOSE ALREADY ENTERED

Instructions on this page do NOT pertain to those of our readers who are already entered in the "AMERICA FIRST" Contest.

If you have already entered, be sure to keep sending in your weekly answers and remittances. By the time all 50 questions appear you will have remitted a minimum of $1.00 (covering the first 20 questions). Then you will send in your answers to the 30 questions on the Constitution with a remittance of $1.50 and you are fully qualified to be computed for the cash prizes.

GET YOUR CONSTITUTION WITH THIS

CONTEST MANAGER, SOCIAL JUSTICE,
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN.

I intend to enter your "AMERICA FIRST" Contest when all 50 Contest questions appear, on December 16. Between now and then I wish to study the *Constitution* of the United States.

Please send me, without obligation on my part, the illuminated wall copy of the *Constitution* which all qualified contestants are to receive. I want to study it in preparation for the questions. Also please send me all past history questions which have appeared.

*My Name Is*_____

*My Address Is*_____

*City or Town*_____ *State*_____

Comment

Fr. Lord Questions Einstein

IN THE DECEMBER issue of *The Queen's Work*, the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S. J., cleverly questions Prof. Albert Einstein, the God-denying refugee scientist recently admitted to citizenship.

"Right now, Mr. Einstein, the world needs that personal God pretty badly," Father Lord writes.

"Humanity has done terrible things to humanity.

"Scientists have made dictators so powerful that they translate their 'divine impulses' into the law that governs millions.

"If humanity is a god, it's a god gone mad!" the St. Louis priest-editor asserts.

"May we ask you a question?" Father Lord queries.

"Suppose that in a gathering of physicists a man arose and said: 'Your theory of relativity is awful nonsense,' wouldn't you ask, 'Are you a physicist?' If he answered 'No,' you would suggest, 'But you are widely read in physics and mathematics?' If he would again say, 'No,' would you bother talking to him?

"How many years did you spend studying theology? or its philosophical counterpart, theodicy? Do you know Aristotle and Plato and Aquinas and Suarez? We do not mean to laugh, but haven't we a right to do so?

"When you write 'the Good, the True, and the Beautiful in Humanity' all in capital letters, you make us think of Hitler. In one of his private utterances he said almost the same thing.

"Do you men who talk so carelessly of things outside your field ever realize what you are doing?

"After you told Hitler he was the only god (since he is life's highest expression, man), were you surprised when he started to act like a pagan god gone mad?

"You told him there was no divine personal lawgiver to whom he was responsible, and he began to act like a person not responsible.

"You told him to find divinity in humanity, and he found it — in the German people. And because he dislikes the Jewish people, who see a deity to whom even the Fuehrer must be responsible, he kicked you out. And you yourself have been one of the worst sufferers.

"May we say you are a little confusing? You find an 'ordered regularity in all events,' and then you say that no one ordered these events.

"If through a powerful telescope a scientist on Mars saw 'the ordered regularity' of American railroads but stated, 'the more I study this ordered regularity, the firmer becomes my conviction that trains manufacture themselves and schedules are formulated without men's intellects or wills,' you would regard the Martian as insane.

"Yet you yourself admit an ordered world and insist that it produced its own order.

"You find a world full of law but think that the laws made and enforce themselves."

Where Do Catholics Live?

THE *Milwaukee Herald Citizen* informs us that 80 per cent of Catholics live in cities and towns of more than 2,500 and only 20 per cent dwell in rural districts.

This, the *Herald* continues, is a "lopsided proportion in a country where the population generally is almost evenly split between urban and rural dwellers."

According to the Rev. Dr. Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., director of the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, it is "evidence of the continued weakness of the rural church."

Analyzing the census returns of 1936, Dr. Schmiedeler points out these facts:

Catholic Population: 16,041,764, or 80.6 per cent; urban; 3,874,173, or 19.4 per cent, rural.

Parish Schools: 5,001, or 73.3 per cent, urban; 1,824, or 26.7, rural.

Students: 1,859,341, or 88.7 per cent, urban; 253,913, or 11.3, rural.

Churches: 7,583, or 45.3 per cent, urban; 9,099, or 54.7, rural.

Church values: $637,474,311, or 81 per cent, urban; $140,527,046, or 19 per cent, rural.

In most states the Catholic city population runs far ahead of Catholic country population but in some few states, Iowa, Kansas and Louisiana, it is evenly split, and in some few others, North Dakota, South Dakota and New Mexico, it is decidedly rural.

"In view of the nation's declining birth rate, this comparison between the urban and the rural church, as presented by the census, is particularly unfortunate," says Dr. Schmiedeler. "The birth rate of the country as a whole is declining. Any evidence that this adverse tide is being stemmed comes from rural areas, and usually from Catholic rather than non-Catholic groups. Therefore, it is to be regretted that the country's most promising bulwark against a dwindling population is weaker than its urban counterpart.

"As evidence of the latter, the case of a public and a parochial school in a country town is cited. For decades the public school in question was much larger than the parochial unit. Today the parochial school shows an attendance of 282 in the grades and 144 in the high school—a total of 426 pupils—while the public school shows 174 in the grades and 124 in high school—a total of 298 pupils.

"It is very much a mistake to think that birth control has not also become a curse of the rural population in general. The rural public grade school population dropped by 1-million between 1930 and 1940. That is the same as the drop in the urban public schools."

From the recent election returns, it is evident that the cities — discounting the solid South—determined the outcome of the election.

Without even intimating that Catholics should establish a political party and thereby add only to the misery of political partyism already extant in America, we do suggest that it is a pity that there is not more unanimity among Catholics.

And to analyze this, one might suggest that there ought to be more unanimity among Catholic leadership.

Granted that there is some type of coalition—intellectual coalition as well as moral coalition—it were possible for the Catholics of New York City to keep Communists off the public payroll and to keep out of power a political party which favors the induction of Communists into offices of public life.

The same observation holds good for Boston, Brooklyn, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland and Chicago.

And by the same token there are Catholics holding public office in these centers of population of whom Catholics are not proud.

But it is many moons since leaders of Catholicism summoned the notorious political gangsters before the bar of public opinion to castigate them for having brought disrepute upon the Catholic citizens in general.

It is possible for the virtue of prudence to lapse into a vice by excess as well as by defect.

In fact, prudence may become a first cousin of cowardice when handled by certain persons who are overly much concerned with staying on the right side of government even though it is a bad government; overly much concerned with staying on the right side of creditors lest the precious brick and mortar which they control will be confiscated by the said creditors.

Archbishop Mannix

HIS EXCELLENCY, Archbishop Mannix of Melbourne, Australia, recently issued a statement relative to the question of war.

In summary, he said that the basic reason for war was man's turning from God and from principles of Christian religion.

Commenting upon the drift to paganism, this eminent churchman lamented the tendency to talk about the traditions of the past without practicing them in the present.

The people of the English speaking world remember Archbishop Mannix whose name was so prominently in the news during and immediately following the first World War.

Like the late lamented Michael James Gallagher, one-time Bishop of Detroit, Dr. Mannix was an ardent Irishman who spoke fearlessly against British oppression as manifested in the Emerald Isle, and in behalf of the liberty which Downing Street denied Dublin.

For his outspoken remarks during those former hectic days, the Archbishop, en route to England from Australia, was apprehended by a unit of the British navy. His freedom of expression was restricted; his respectable name was besmirched; and his cause was derided.

At that time he strongly intimated that the oppression endured by the Irish was anti-Christian.

Thus, in our days when the scourge of war is humbling a false civilization to its knees, one can not help but recognize that the social sins of the paganistic past are exacting their toll of suffering upon the entire world.

Great Britain is not exempted, nor can we expect the United States to be exempted, despite our praise of Christian traditions and principles which we are accustomed to mouth; for though we honor them in speech, we mock them in practice.

God will not be mocked. Nor will He spare us unless we repent.

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Will Britain Win?

WILLIAM H. STONEMAN, London correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*, said (Nov. 7th) that Britain can not win the war with her own arms production, plus that of the United States, with the present amount of war material which we are sending abroad.

Mr. Stoneman is rather an important correspondent. It is he who scooped the news-gathering world in connection with the match king, Ivar Kreuger. He was present at the retreat in Flanders, and has been an eye witness of the battle of Britain.

* * *

To the *Daily News* he contributed the following:

"As things stand it is probable," said Stoneman, "that the air raids will go on with ever increased frequency and scope during the Winter months. Britain can not ever undertake an offensive against Germany unless production is very substantially increased.

"It is my personal opinion that the British alone cannot win this war, either with their own production of weapons or with their own production, as of next Spring, plus what the United States is now prepared to send her.

"Even the United States cannot supply the quantities of material necessary to win the war against Germany, unless it is willing to apply itself 24 hours a day and to make sacrifices of money and economy.

"I frankly don't believe that the United States will ever make those sacrifices unless she feels so strongly about the need of stopping the Axis that she is actually prepared to declare war.

"If you can decide in your own mind whether this country can or cannot afford to see Britain lose this war you may be able to decide what we ought to do about it, if anything."

* * *

Many persons share Mr. Stoneman's opinion.

Many persons have made up their minds that the best thing for the United States to do is to throw all our assets on the table to help Britain win.

Already our national debt is approximately $50-billion.

An "all-out" contribution to Great Britain would pyramid this debt to $100-billion.

If and when peace is declared, a radical readjustment of our tax system will be necessary — so radical that bankrupt England will have accepted the economic aspects of Communism; so radical that depressed America will either repudiate its debts or follow suit with England.

The economic system which both these governments are endeavoring to defend will be plowed under.

The greatest contribution to civilization which we Americans could make at the present moment would be to bend our every effort to bring about peace by Christmas.

Peace will come sooner or later.

Why not sooner?

Why prolong this misery which can result only in a victory for Karl Marx?

Another two years of this war will result in a dead man's philosophy having destroyed a living civilization.

What Is the Meaning of Our 'Neutral' Ship Maneuvers

(*See Story on Page 11*)